

Richard W. Burgess

Roman Imperial Chronology and Early-Fourth-Century Historiography

The Regnal Durations of the So-called *Chronica
urbis Romae* of the *Chronograph of 354*

Historia

Alte Geschichte

Historia – Einzelschriften 234

Franz Steiner Verlag

Richard W. Burgess
Roman Imperial Chronology
and Early-Fourth-Century Historiography

HISTORIA Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte | Revue d'histoire ancienne |
Journal of Ancient History | Rivista di storia antica

EINZELSCHRIFTEN Herausgegeben von Kai Brodersen, Erfurt |
Mortimer Chambers, Los Angeles | Martin Jehne, Dresden | Mischa Meier,
Tübingen | Walter Scheidel, Stanford

Band 234

Richard W. Burgess

Roman Imperial Chronology and Early-Fourth-Century Historiography

The Regnal Durations of the So-called *Chronica urbis
Romae* of the *Chronograph* of 354



Franz Steiner Verlag

Cover illustration:

folio 65r of Österreichische Nationalbibliothek manuscript 3416,
showing the accounts of the emperors from Severus Alexander to Aurelian
from the *Breviarium Vindobonense*.

Reproduced with the kind permission of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über
<<http://dnb.d-nb.de>> abrufbar.

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes
ist unzulässig und strafbar.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2014

Druck: AZ Druck und Datentechnik, Kempten

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-515-10725-9 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-515-10732-7 (E-Book)

FOREWORD

This book was supposed to be a short appendix to a chapter on the so-called *Chronica urbis Romae* of the *Chronograph of 354* in volume two of *Mosaics of Time*. But as I wrote it in the spring and summer of 2011 it quickly got out of hand, in the same way that *Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography* – which was supposed to be two appendices to material that will now eventually appear in volume three of *Mosaics* – got out of hand. All I wanted to do was compare the regnal years of this text to a few more authoritative sources in order to evaluate the validity of its figures. My general opinion was that all its numbers were valueless and I just wanted to be able to back up that impression with some facts. As can now be seen, my conclusions are rather different and more nuanced than my original impressions. I have also ended up with a long list of wholly unanticipated yet interesting observations and conclusions on all sorts of topics and texts, most of which I believe are presented here for the first time.

My simple goal of comparing the evidence of the so-called *Chronica* to the other existing evidence explains the overly technical and rather monolithic nature of the bulk of this work: in spite of its length it really is for the most part just a long series of comparisons with a running commentary, but that is all that is needed. This analysis is not glamorous, but it is necessary, and no one has attempted an investigation of this work on this scale before, so it was time that it was done. Because this is in many ways a pioneering study and one that has taken me into many periods of Roman history that are unfamiliar to me, there are bound to be sources that I have missed and texts that I have misinterpreted. So be it. Let this then be not the final word, but a starting point, a foundation upon which others with a taste for the technical and unglamorous can build a more accurate account. That is something I welcome.

As will be seen when *Mosaics 2* appears, however, this ‘appendix’ has ended up bereft of its parent, since my co-author, Michael Kulikowski, and I decided in the summer of 2013 to remove the *Chronica urbis Romae* material from *Mosaics* altogether. *Mosaics of Time* is a study of Latin chronicles, and even though we knew from the beginning that, in spite of the title Mommsen gave it, this work was not a chronicle, it was the closest thing to a chronicle to survive from the period between the mid-second and mid-fourth centuries, and many of its entries present parallels and similarities to surviving *consularia*, a native Latin form of chronicle, that suggest that such chronicles were among its sources (this will be discussed in Appendix 4). However, as volume two grew longer and longer, it became clear that the peripheral nature of this text to our central theme meant that we could no longer justify its inclusion. Some work will be lost as a result of our decision to drop this text from *Mosaics 2*, but it will also mean that the material presented here, especially the introduction, will not now be duplicated. The edition and translation have been re-

moved from *Mosaics 2* to Appendix 3 here, and what was originally a fairly compact analysis of the sources has been updated, expanded, and included here in Appendix 4 as a necessary extension of the historiographical analysis that makes up the entirety of this volume. These additions have further slowed the appearance of this volume by some months.

I would like to thank my wife, Louise, as always, for being a sounding board for my often bizarre arguments and ideas, and for detailed assistance with the text and translation; Michael Kulikowski for his advice and assistance during composition; Serena Ryder, whose new album *Harmony* became the soundtrack (both recorded and live) for the final push to complete this book in the late winter, spring, and early summer of 2013 after a two-year-long hiatus spent completing a number of long foundation articles for *Mosaics of Time 2* and completing *Mosaics of Time 1*; and particularly the anonymous reader for *Historia Einzelschriften*, who quickly provided many pages of detailed and general comments, suggestions, fixes, corrections, and encouragement. If only we could always get such dedicated and enthusiastic referees.

Ciuitate Ottaiensi
id. Ian. MMXIII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations	8
1. An Introduction to the Text	9
2. An Introduction to the Problem and this Study	15
3. The Pre-Roman Kings of Italy and Alba Longa	19
4. The Major Sources	28
5. The Roman Emperors from Julius Caesar to Licinius	34
6. Summary	87
7. General Conclusions	115
Appendix 1. The Imperial Chronologies of Cassius Dio	119
Appendix 2. The Witnesses to the <i>Kaisergeschichte</i>	135
Appendix 3. Critical Edition and Translation of the <i>Breviarium Vindobonense</i>	142
Appendix 4. Parallels in Other Texts	158
Bibliography	193
1. Editions of Ancient Texts Quoted or Discussed	193
2. Literature Cited	196
Index	200

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AE</i>	<i>L'Année épigraphique</i> . Paris, 1888–.
<i>CFHB</i>	<i>Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae</i>
<i>CLRE</i>	R.S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S.R. Schwartz, and K.A. Worp. <i>Consuls of the Later Roman Empire</i> . Atlanta, 1987.
<i>CSHB</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae</i>
<i>D</i>	A. Degrassi. <i>Inscriptiones Italiae</i> 13, <i>Fasti et elogia</i> 2, <i>Fasti anni Numani et Iuliani</i> . Rome, 1963. Inscriptions are cited by text number then page number.
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte</i>
<i>HLL 4</i>	R. Herzog and P.L. Schmidt (edd.). <i>Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike 4. Die Literatur des Umbruchs, von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur, 117 bis 284 n. Chr.</i> Munich, 1997.
<i>HLL 5</i>	R. Herzog and P.L. Schmidt (edd.). <i>Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike 5. Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.</i> Munich, 1989.
<i>KG</i>	<i>Kaisergeschichte</i> . A now-lost common source of Aur. Victor, Eutropius, Jerome, the <i>HA</i> , and the <i>Epit. de caes.</i>
Kienast	D. Kienast. <i>Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie</i> . ² Darmstadt, 1996.
<i>MGH: AA</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica: auctores antiquissimi</i>
<i>MGH: SSRM</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica: scriptores rerum Merovingicarum</i>
<i>OCD</i>	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, and E. Eidinow (edd.). <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . ⁴ Oxford, 2012.
<i>ODB</i>	A.P. Kazhdan (ed.). <i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> . New York/Oxford, 1991.
Peachin	M. Peachin. <i>Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235–284</i> . Amsterdam, 1990.
<i>PG</i>	Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.). <i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca</i> . 161 vols. Paris, 1857–66.
<i>RE</i>	G. Wissowa, et al. (ed.). <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . 82 vols. Stuttgart, 1894–1980.
<i>RIC</i>	P.H. Webb. <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage</i> , vol. 5.1. London, 1927.
<i>TU</i>	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur

1. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXT

Contained within a small group of texts usually associated with the compendium known as the *Chronograph of 354* on folios 62r to 65v and 70r of manuscript no. 3416 of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna (V) is a very short acephalous account of the rulers of central Italy, Alba Longa, and Rome, from Faunus to the death of Licinius in early 325. Mommsen called this text the *Chronica urbis Romae* (*Chronicle of the City of Rome*), but it is not a chronicle and this name should not be perpetuated.¹ It is sometimes called the *Origo gentis Romanorum* (as in *HLL* 5), but this is not a title, it is simply the first three words of the first of a number of rubricated headings in the manuscript.² The original title (if it had one) was lost when it was used to replace the list of emperors at the end of the *Liber generationis*, which precedes it in the manuscript (see below). It is most often referred to simply by the name of the *Chronograph of 354*, but contrary to a scholarly consensus of over 160 years it was not a part of the original compilation in 354 and its composition predates that compilation by about twenty years (see below). It is therefore a text whose origins are completely independent of the *Chronograph*. Since it is neither a chronicle nor part of the *Chron. 354*, and ‘*Origo gentis Romanorum*’ is just a section heading, a new name is therefore required and something like the *Breviarium Vindobonense* is appropriately descriptive and will suffice to emphasize the two important points that it is not a chronicle and has an origin independent of the *Chronograph* and the year 354. Here I shall simply refer to it as the *Breviarium*.³

- 1 Mommsen 1892: 37, 141 (= ‘Stadtchronik von Rom’ in Mommsen 1850: 598). A definition of a chronicle that takes into account all chronicles from the earliest Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles to the latest medieval examples can be found in Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 12–35, 59–60.
- 2 These rubricated section headings can be seen printed in bold in the edition in Appendix 3. They follow on from similarly rubricated headings in the *Liber generationis* (which are unfortunately not indicated by Mommsen in his edition), to which the *Chronica* is attached in V as an integral part; see Burgess 2012: 369–70, 371–2. Thus ‘*Origo gentis Romanorum ex quo primum in Italia regnare coeperunt*’ is just a heading that covers the first section of the work from Picus to Ascanius, not the title of the work as a whole. This is confirmed by the *breviarium* associated with Aurelius Victor that is similarly called the *Origo gentis Romanae*: it covers the period from Saturn to Romulus and Remus.
- 3 For a short but confused discussion of this work and a list of the few references to it in modern scholarship, see *HLL* 5, §531.5. Studies and editions of the text can be found in Mommsen 1850: 598–601, 644–55; Mommsen 1892: 141–8; Frick 1892: lxi, ccxv–ccvi, 111–22 (where it is edited as an integral part of the *Liber generationis*, which Frick calls the *Chronicon anni 334*); and Valentini and Zucchetti 1940: 266–81 (where earlier editions are noted on p. 268). Mommsen’s two editions and Valentini and Zucchetti also include commentaries, the former after the edition, the latter two at the foot of each page of the edition. A few other comments on the text can be found in Salzman 1990: 52–6. For the general background to the *Chronograph*

The *Breviarium* was compiled in Rome between mid-325 (the death of Licinius) and mid-337 (the death of Constantine) and was soon afterwards combined with two other texts that had been produced in Rome around the same time: a Latin translation made in 334 of a Christian Greek chronograph called the *Συναγωγή χρόνων καὶ ἐτῶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἕως τῆς ἐνεστώσης ἡμέρας* ('A Collection of Chronologies from the Creation of the World to the Present Day'), better known through three independent Latin translations that are collectively known as the *Liber generationis*; and the *Notitia regionum urbis XIV*, a detailed listing of the buildings of Rome organized according to the fourteen Augustan regions, which was compiled between 337 and 357 from much earlier texts.⁴ The list of emperors that had originally existed at the end of the *Liber generationis* was removed, and the *Breviarium* was added in its place to form a single text. The table of contents of the *Lib. gen.* was then changed to reflect this expansion (§ 19; Mommsen 1892: 90 and Frick 1892: 82.9–10, with the changes in italics). Evidently around 575 this copy of the *Liber generationis-Breviarium* and *Notitia* was combined with a chronicle I call the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* (*CVpr*), which only survives in two incomplete witnesses: a text that Mommsen called the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores*, copied c. 1495, and the *Excerpta Sangallensia*, copied in the 830s (Mommsen 1892: 263–4, 274–300, 304–12, 316, 318, 320). This entire text was then recopied at the end of the sixth century or early seventh century. The *CVpr* was added to the *Liber generationis-Breviarium* as a complement to and completion of the historical account of the earlier part of the work, and the *Notitia* was retained at the end. This addition was also marked in the table of contents of the *Liber generationis*.

At the end of the eighth century there appeared in Gaul for the first time the compilation known as the *Chronograph of 354*, an illustrated chronograph compiled in Rome in late 353 and composed primarily of a calendar, consular *fasti*, an Easter table, a list of urban prefects, lists of the death dates and burial places of the bishops of Rome and martyrs, and the earliest known version of the *Liber pontificalis*. Its close connection with Rome, and its *fasti* and frequent use of consular dates soon brought it into contact with the similarly Romanocentric and consular-filled *Liber generationis-Breviarium/CVpr/Notitia* compendium described above, and the two works were bound together. The archetype of manuscript V, which was copied very early in the ninth century, contained the *Chron. 354* followed after a blank folium by the *Liber generationis* compendium, but by the time the now-lost Luxemburgensis manuscript, the archetype of most other surviving witnesses to the *Chron. 354*, was copied at the end of the ninth or perhaps even beginning of the tenth century, the original manuscript had suffered serious damage: the *Chron. 354* had become unbound from the *Liber generationis* compendium and had itself broken in half and been put back together in the wrong order. As a

of 354 as a whole, see *HLL* 5, §§ 531.2, 531.3, and 531.4, and Mommsen 1850, Strzykowski 1888, Mommsen 1892, Stern 1953, Binder 1970, Salzman 1990, and Burgess 2012. Complete editions of the texts can be found in Mommsen 1892 and Mommsen 1893, and photographs of most of the illustrations can be found in Strzykowski 1888, Stern 1953, and Salzman 1990.

4 This and all of what follows on the history of the text and the manuscripts derives from Burgess 2012.

result the Luxemburgensis preserved only the *Chron. 354*, and the two halves of that text were backwards.

Manuscript V first appears in the library of Johan Fuchsmagen, who had died in Vienna on 3 May 1510 and bequeathed that library to the great Viennese humanist Johannes Cuspinianus. We do not know for certain where or when he found the archetype for V, but he had it copied at the Vischer school in Nuremberg, an area of southern Germany where other manuscripts with text from the *Chron. 354* had been copied between about 1450 and 1475, no doubt from the same archetype. This strongly implies that Fuchsmagen found the manuscript locally, borrowed it, and had it copied there. Since Fuchsmagen adopted his Latin ‘humanist’ name in 1497 (‘Fusemannus’), his non-humanist signature in V at the bottom of fol. 3r (‘Ioh(ann)is Fuchsmag(en) doct(or)is’) suggests that this manuscript was copied before that date. Unfortunately, apart from the style of the illustrations, which puts the copying around 1500, there is no other way to date the manuscript. After Cuspinian’s death in 1529, V and a large number of other manuscripts from Cuspinian’s library were purchased by Johann Fabri, bishop of Vienna from 1530 to 1541. Although this manuscript had originally been marked out by Fabri for the trilingual college of St. Nicholas that he had founded in 1539, it and other important manuscripts from Fabri’s library went instead to the Augustissima Bibliotheca Caesarea – now the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek – when he died in 1541.

Manuscript V provides us with the only complete text of the *Breviarium*, but two others provide us with a few excerpts. St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 878 (S) was the *vademecum* of Walahfrid Strabo, abbot of Reichenau between 838 and 849. Excerpts from the text of the *Breviarium*, along with a number of other texts from the *Chron. 354*, were copied between 829 and 838 when Walahfrid was court tutor at Aachen for the future king Louis the Bald.⁵ Walahfrid copied five excerpts from the *Breviarium*: a piglet that looked like an elephant from the reign of Verus, a mule that ate a man from the reign of Gordian, and widespread death (plague) from the reign of Gallus and Volusian, and two entries on polyphages – circus performers who would consume prodigious amounts of food and drink – from the reigns of Nero and Severus Alexander. The manuscript Walahfrid copied was perhaps only one generation removed from the archetype of V, since both derived from the same manuscript that had appeared in Francia at the end of the eighth century.

The other witness to the *Breviarium* is a tenth- or eleventh-century marginal addition on the reign of Romulus made to the top of fol. 68r of manuscript S.XXI.5 of the Istituzione Biblioteca Malatestiana in Cesena, Italy (C), a manuscript of the first third of the ninth century. The origin of the manuscript and the addition are north-eastern Italian and therefore unrelated to the tradition of the texts found in V and S. Neither Stern nor Salzman mentions this manuscript, and it is only vaguely and incorrectly noted by Mommsen (1892: 33).⁶ Frick knew of neither S nor C.

5 See Bischoff 1967, esp. pp. 37, 39–40, 43–4, 47–48, and Burgess 2012: 363–8 for the excerpts from the *Chron. 354*.

6 For the details of the manuscript, see Bellettini 2004: 52 and 64, and for a comparison of the readings of C and V, see Burgess 2012: 379–80.

A very few overriding interests guided the compilation and composition of the *Breviarium*, and they are responsible for its rigid structure. First and foremost, the compiler was only concerned with the kings and emperors of pre-Roman and Roman history. Elected consuls are of no interest: the author replaces them with a muddled list of ‘dictators’, which is in reality nothing more than a collection, not even in chronological order, of famous names from the Republic, culled, probably, from a text like the *Liber de uiris illustribus*, which is found in the manuscripts of the *breviarium* of Aurelius Victor. All the names but Laenas, Barbatus, Rutulus, and the obviously corrupt ‘Aeneas Julius’ can be found in that work. In the autocracy of the fourth century, it would appear, constitutional arrangements other than monarchy were not worth considering. We see an even quicker jump from the regnal period to the imperial period in the *CVpr* (Mommsen 1892: 274). Almost certainly the Alban kings were originally treated like all the other early kings, but their descriptions must have been ruthlessly removed at one point since there are a number of well-known stories about them that could have appeared here, and the list is not only missing such descriptions as we find for the earlier kings, but even the words ‘regnauit annis/annos’ that appear for every other king and emperor have been excised as well.

The second major interest of the *Breviarium* was chronographic, in the sense of recording how long each king or emperor ruled. The author provides regnal lengths in years for all the early kings, even for such mythological figures as Picus and Faunus, and in years, months, and days for all emperors. It is this interest in exact chronology that contributes to the *Breviarium*’s unique flavour and helps to set it apart from other historical works, not least those of classicizing historians. Because of this unusual interest, in fact, the *Breviarium* is the only literary source to provide such detailed information on the lengths of so many Roman emperors.

The third main interest is the amount of money disbursed by the emperors to the Roman people in the form of largesse. The precedent is set in the account of Romulus, whose first distribution also provides the derivation of the Latin word for largesse (*congiarium* > *congius*). Numa and Ancus Marcius then provide evidence for what seems to be presented as the evolution of regal/imperial largesse from wine to leather coins to weighed amounts of inscribed bronze (first to the soldiers) to actual coins, always denarii, which first appear under Caesar. Not all emperors gave the largesse they promised, however, and this is noted for two of them (Galba and Quintillus). The note on the distribution of largesse is omitted for Otho, Vitellius, Didius Julianus, Geta, Gordian I and II, Aemilian, Tacitus, Florian, Probus, Carus, Severus, Maxentius, Maximinus, and Licinius. In the case of short-lived emperors this is probably because there was no largesse distributed; in other cases, especially for the more recent emperors, the compiler would seem to have had no information.

The fourth major interest of the compiler is the manner and location of each emperor’s death. As can be seen in Appendix 4, these notices are almost always accurate, far more so than the general Latin tradition at the time (the *KG*; on which see below), and they are closely related to a source that lies behind the death-places reported both by an Armenian translation of a Greek list of emperors and by Euse-

bius' *Chronici canones*. In fact, as we shall see in Chapters 5 and 6 and Appendix 4, much the content of the *Breviarium* is reflected primarily in texts that survive in Greek, not Latin, though it does look as though the compiler was using the original Latin versions of these texts.

These interests explain why Constantine could not appear in the *Breviarium*, even though he had been emperor for twenty or thirty years at the time of composition: for him there could be no regnal duration, final largesse figure, or manner and place of death. This left a huge gap in the compiler's account of Rome, about which nothing since the death of Maxentius in 312 is described.

If the foregoing points of interest all depend upon the central concern with monarchical rulers, the fifth is more general. The author of the *Breviarium* is fascinated with what we would now call 'sensationalist' or 'tabloid' stories, many of the type that the Greeks called παραδοξολογίαι, 'tales of the marvellous'. This was a recognized genre from the third century BC and the many works collecting such stories were very popular in the ancient world.⁷ In this vein, we read notices of a gigantic ship that brought an obelisk to Rome, the collapse of amphitheatres and circuses, a deadly riot caused in the forum when Caligula tossed gold and silver coins from the Basilica Julia into the crowd, polyphages who could (and did) eat and drink prodigious amounts of just about anything,⁸ a piglet that looked like an elephant, the birth of quadruplets, a mule that ate a man, an emperor who had sex with his mother, elephants on display in Rome, fires, disease, famines, and the arrest of over one hundred poisoners and sorcerers. No extant historical work in Latin invests so much attention to such sensationalist stories in proportion to its 'sober' history.

The author's final major interest is architectural: he allots a great deal of space to the buildings of Rome, noting both their construction or dedication and their destruction by fire. This seems quite at variance with the rest of his text, but it clearly keeps to the compiler's interest in Rome itself, and there clearly existed an interest in the architecture of the city in the early fourth century, as can be seen from such works as the *Notitia* mentioned above, which was part of the compendium that included the *Breviarium*. This shared interest in architecture may well explain why these two works came together in the first place. In a way the *Breviarium* includes

7 See *RE* 18.3, coll. 1137–66 (Latin writers are discussed in coll. 1164–6, but the *Breviarium* is not mentioned); *OCD*, 1080, s.v. 'paradoxographers'; and Giannini 1966. Phlegon of Tralles – the freedman of Hadrian who also wrote an Olympiad chronicle – wrote a small book of wonders (in Giannini 1966 and Hansen 1996). Chapters 6–10 and 20–29 relate bizarre events between AD 45 and 125, each with Athenian archon and Roman consuls for dating and many that took place in Rome, involving ἀνδρογύννοι (women who turn into men); many-headed babies; women who gave birth to snakes, an Anubis-headed baby, and an ape; a man giving birth; and women who had multiple births (one with four sets of quintuplets!).

8 See Baldwin 1977. Baldwin is certainly correct that such men were circus performers, like Monsieur Mangetout, but the story in Suetonius, *Nero* 37.2, that it was believed that Nero wanted to throw living men to a *polyphagus*, which would then rip them apart and consume them, does suggest that Suetonius (and his source) believed that a *polyphagus* was some kind of monster like a crocodile, not a circus performer. The Loeb translator translates the word as 'monster', the Penguin translator as 'a sort of ogre'. Baldwin is also right in saying that both the compiler of the *Breviarium* and Suetonius are talking about the same person.

a brief diachronic study of the architecture of Rome, while a work like the *Notitia* was more synchronic and chorographic. What the compiler's sources would have been for such material is unknown – as we shall see in Appendix 4 the *KG* (so it would seem) had access to a closely related source, so the compiler was not the only one interested in such matters – but in general the statements of the author appear to be accurate.

With the exception of the death-places of the emperors, everything described in the *Breviarium* would seem to have taken place within Rome or its immediate environs (like Ostia or Fidenae). The *paradoxologiae* are not situated anywhere specific, but the context suggests that they too are Roman, and the example of Phlegon and his collection of Roman marvels suggests that such city-specific information was easily obtainable.

Conversely, the author of the *Breviarium* is not interested in most of the things that make up the bulk of imperial narrative histories and biographies: battles, wars, invasions, barbarians, usurpations – all events outside Rome and its immediate hinterland – politics and the senate; or the emperors' origins, families, careers, deeds, or relationships to one another. His interest in the armies and soldiers is minimal, and his view of them negative: he mentions a battle between the Romans and the praetorians, and notes that Philip II was killed in the praetorian camp and that because some Romans lynched a Moesian soldier other soldiers killed 6,000 Romans.

It should also be noted, since this is a work of the reign of Constantine and survives as the conclusion of an early-third-century Christian chronographic compendium, that the *Breviarium* is resolutely pagan, even though the Roman gods it mentions are treated euhemeristically, as real people rather than gods. In contrast to so many other writings that survive from this period, there is not the slightest trace in the *Breviarium* that Christianity ever existed: there is no mention of the birth or crucifixion of Jesus, of bishops or martyrs in Rome, of the construction of churches or Christian buildings in Rome, or of persecutions in Rome anywhere in the text, as one would certainly expect were this the work of a Christian author.

Such then is the strange work that is the *Breviarium Vindobonense*.

2. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM AND THIS STUDY

With its strange miscellany – within the larger strange miscellany that is Vindobonensis 3416 – the *Breviarium* provides us with a wealth of information and variant traditions that can be found in no other text. That is the case even on subjects well attested in other sources, particularly the Roman kings. More important for the purposes of the present work, the *Breviarium* preserves a tradition for the imperial period that is independent of all other extant Latin histories, and this is particularly the case for the third and fourth centuries.¹ Of all the texts related to the *Chronograph of 354* it is the *Breviarium* that is cited most often by historians, not only by those interested in the architecture of Rome but especially by those reconstructing the chronology of the third and early fourth centuries. In the former case this is due to the many references to the emperors' building projects in Rome; in the latter it is due to the exact chronology for each of the emperors from Julius Caesar down to Licinius in years, months, and days, data we have from no other single source. No one has need of this text when the durations of emperors' reigns are known or can be calculated from other sources, and so the *Breviarium's* data figure little in accounts of the emperors of the first and second centuries. But for the emperors of the third and early fourth centuries, where we have little or no detailed information from other sources, the *Breviarium* provides a treasure trove of detailed chronology for modern scholars. No one, it seems, can resist the allure of these figures, and even the best scholars have employed them to shed chronological light where little has ever shone before.

Unfortunately, there is a problem with the enthusiastic use of the figures of the *Breviarium* by modern scholars. Michael Peachin, in discussing the reigns of the third-century emperors, is one of the very few who seriously confronts this problem:

The *Chronograph [of 354]* purports to give the exact duration of the reigns of most third century emperors, and indeed, it has been lent much credence by recent studies [citing Schwartz 1977 and Chastagnol 1980]. Nevertheless, I have seen no serious attempt to determine its real value as regards the dates that it supplies. Its value, of course, will depend ultimately upon its sources. But since the sources used by the chronographer elude us, once again so must its true worth (Peachin, 23–4).

As Peachin indicates, the history of the text is unknown outside its appearance in the three manuscripts mentioned in Chapter 1, V, S, and C. Yet *Quellenforschung* shows that, although the work was composed in Latin and apparently in Rome with the use of at least some local Latin texts, in general it derives from sources quite different from and in most cases better than those employed by the roughly contemporary author of the now-lost work today known as the *Kaisergeschichte (KG)*.²

1 See Appendix 4 and Barnes 1970: 24.

2 See Chapter 6 and Appendix 4.

Unfortunately, it was the *KG* that ended up providing us with the basic Latin account of the Roman empire in the third century through its numerous surviving witnesses: Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Festus, Jerome's *Chronici canones*, the *Epitome de caesaribus*, the *Historia augusta*, and even Ammianus Marcellinus. Why the compiler of the *Breviarium*, writing in the 330s, should have had access to better sources than the author of the *KG*, writing perhaps twenty or twenty-five years later, is unknown, especially since the former's sources appear to have been widely disseminated: most of our evidence for them comes from a variety of contemporary and later texts written in Greek, some as late as the twelfth century. If historical texts could make their way to Constantinople, Alexandria, and Caesarea (and in translation even to Armenia), could they not also make their way to Italy or the western provinces, wherever it was that the *KG* was compiled? In the end, perhaps it was simply that the compiler of the *KG* was not a very good historian or judge of sources. *Quellenforschung* also demonstrates that the *Breviarium* is a compilation, derived from many different kinds of sources of quite differing types and value. Such a patchwork nature does not prompt ready confidence in its content. These matters will be briefly set out in Chapters 6 and 7 and Appendix 4.

As noted above in Chapter 1, one of the characteristics of the *Breviarium* is its compiler's interest in what we might call quantifiable data: how long kings and emperors reigned, how much money they distributed to the people, how many people were killed in certain disasters or arrested in an imperial crackdown, the capacity of an obelisk ship, the numbers of different types of buildings, how many napkins, pine cones, or melons a polyphage could eat, and so on. The problem is that such numbers are not so easily confirmed by other sources as the accounts of imperial building projects or the locations of the deaths of the emperors can be. Even when we have other sources for comparison, there are difficulties. For instance, there is the collapse of a makeshift amphitheatre in Fidenae during the reign of Tiberius: Suetonius (*Tiberius* 40) says that more than 20,000 died; Tacitus (*Annals* 4.63) says 50,000 were killed or wounded. These numbers seem extreme, especially given that Tacitus' number is one of the standard modern estimates for the capacity of the Colosseum, one of the largest known permanent amphitheatres in the Roman world. On close inspection we are forced to admit that these are the sort of inflated figures that we might expect from the *Breviarium* itself, not from serious historians. Yet the *Breviarium* states that only 4,205 died. This figure is much more likely to be correct given what we know about the capacity of Julio-Claudian amphitheatres and has the sort of precision that lends verisimilitude to the number.³ But none of that means that it is in fact accurate, and a single counter-example will reinforce that impression. We know from his *Res Gestae* (15.1) that Augustus gave largesse to the *plebs* five times totalling 420 denarii per person. Of those were three donatives of 100 denarii each. The *Breviarium*, by contrast, says he thrice gave largesse of 362.5 denarii, which suits neither statement and cannot be a simple scribal error for 420 or 100. Normally the apparent precision of a figure like '362.5' would lend

3 For this, see most recently Chamberland 2007: 136 n. 1: the 'figure [of] 4,205 is certainly much closer to the truth'.

credence to the numbers presented and would do so here were it not proven false by the actual giver of the donative himself.⁴ But on the other hand, for instance, we know from Suetonius, *Nero* 10.1 that Nero gave largesse of four hundred sestertii (= one hundred denarii) and from *Domitian* 4.5 that Domitian gave three hundred sestertii (= seventy-five denarii) three times during his reign, both exactly as the *Breviarium* states (§ 40 and 46). But twice the *Breviarium* says emperors gave largesse of seventy-two and half denarii (§§ 37 and 38), when we know that the standard figure at the time was seventy-five (see Appendix 4). Although LXXII is an easy scribal error for LXXV, there is no way to explain the half ('-S'). There can be problems of interpretation as well. The *Breviarium* says that Macrinus gave largesse of 150 denarii, and this is confirmed by Dio (78.34.3), but he says that it was not actual money, but a banquet at which each meal was worth that amount. The more one tries to pin down the reliability of the figures in any sort of general way, the more one ends up going in circles. The problem is that we can detect these sorts of problem only where we have other sources, and when we have no such confirmation – which is very often in this text and the main reason for its importance – there is enough detectable error that we cannot wholly trust what the *Breviarium* reports. And these examples involving figures are particularly troubling since, as we saw above, some of the most valuable data contained in the *Breviarium* are its figures for the lengths of the emperors' reigns. No general estimation of the reliability of the *Breviarium*'s numbers can therefore be of any value. Every set of figures will have to be analysed one at a time, one after the other. And that is what we must now do.

In order to evaluate the reliability of the figures for the reigns of the third and early fourth centuries, we must first determine the reliability of the figures for the earlier emperors, where we have corroborative data, and from that study we can learn how such figures were calculated and promulgated, what sorts of errors could occur and what sorts of traditions existed. From that we can make judgements about the reliability of the figures that interest us the most. Thus *Quellenforschung* can be of use even when no other similar works survive and we have no idea of how these sorts of figures were transmitted from text to text, from historian to historian. Such analysis is no easy matter; proper *Quellenforschung* never is, and that is why it is usually avoided or employed so poorly, and the method required is no doubt why a study such as this has never been undertaken or published. For meaningful results can only be produced by a repetitious and monotonous comparison of each number in the *Breviarium*, not only with the currently accepted dates of the emperors' accessions and deaths, but also with all other relevant surviving references to the durations of the emperors' reigns in order to determine each number's accuracy and its relationship to other extant durations. The results not only provide a very clear estimation of the value of this work, but they also tell us much about the mechanics of the transmission of historical data and the historiographical methods and traditions within the Roman and Byzantine empires. They even provide some new historical conclusions.

4 Augustus' first four donatives totalled 360 denarii, so perhaps that lies at the heart of this number. Later in the text LXXIIS is twice given for LXXV (see below), so perhaps the original text had CCCLXV for Augustus.

Such, then, in outline, is the main subject, purpose, and method of this volume, which will now move on to a test case for our investigation of the numbers in the *Breviarium*, the regnal years of the Alban kings. We then proceed to an introduction to the sources employed in the main analysis, since most readers will be unfamiliar with many of them. Thus armed with some basic varieties of possible corruption and a familiarity with the sources, we then begin Chapter 5 and the analysis that lies at the heart of this project, an emperor by emperor investigation of the accuracy of the *Breviarium*'s regnal durations. The importance of Dio for these chronological and historiographical analyses, his infrequent but puzzling aberrations from accepted regnal year totals, and his seemingly eccentric calculation methods necessitate a separate study on his regnal-year terms, and this appears in Appendix 1. This appendix is followed by an analysis of the regnal duration figures in the witnesses to the *KG* as a means of ascertaining the figures originally contained in that work (Appendix 2). The final two appendices relate directly to the text of the *Breviarium* itself. Appendix 3 presents a new critical edition of the text with an English translation. Appendix 4 quotes the textual parallels that can be found in other works and presents a comparison of the evidence for the death-places of the emperors found in the *Breviarium* with other fourth-century texts, particularly Eusebius and the *KG*. This will provide a fuller context for the historiographical conclusions that arise from the main analysis of this volume.

3. THE PRE-ROMAN KINGS OF ITALY AND ALBA LONGA

As strange as it may seem, we must begin our analysis with the list of the pre-Roman kings of Italy and Alba Longa. This list is important because of its nature: there are a number of variant lists of the Alban kings in Greek and Latin, including this one, but their similarities show that they all derive from a single common ancestor of which each surviving list is an indirect witness.¹ The *Breviarium* is part of this tradition and is very closely related to the list that lies behind the lists in Diodorus Siculus and Ovid's *Fasti* (where the only difference is the absence of Aeneas Silvius, apparently Ovid's own contribution to the tradition; see below), even though these latter texts are hundreds of years earlier than the *Breviarium*. I could have taken the list of Roman kings as the subject of this chapter instead, but there are fewer of them, the corruptions are less telling, and the analysis would be, for my tastes at any rate, less interesting and useful. Tables 1 and 2 below set forth the evidence of the main surviving sources.² In Table 2B various tertiary witnesses resolve into two secondary witnesses: Eusebius' *Chronographia*, the first volume of his two-part chronological opus and a compilation of quotations from his sources and of regnal lists culled from them; and the *Chronici canones*, his famous chronicle, an original work in which the regnal lists of the first volume, the *Chronographia*, were combined with historical information into Eusebius' final chronology. These data were derived by Eusebius from the passage of Diodorus cited below in Table 2A, which Eusebius quotes in his *Chronographia* (Karst, 136–9) and for which he is in fact our only source; from Dionysius, which Eusebius also quotes in full in the *Chronographia* (Karst, 130–1); and from at least one other unknown source, which would account for Eusebius' variants not found in Diodorus or Dionysius.³ Table 2B is quite detailed and complex, yet the net value at first seems to

- 1 The list seems to owe its origins to Fabius Pictor and his third century BC source, Diocles of Peparethus, as Plutarch says in *Romulus* 3.2. But if Diocles or Fabius is the root of this bush, the texts cited here are at the ends of a number of large branches of the tradition. In addition to these literary sources, we must not forget that there were also the statues of all the Alban kings in the Forum of Augustus with *elogia* that listed the length of each king's reign. These certainly derived from earlier written traditions and may also have influenced later traditions. Inscriptions survive for Aeneas, Aeneas Silvius, Alba, Capys, Calpetus, and Proca. See Geiger 2008: 129–31. Since at least 1860 this list along with the lists of the pre-Alban and Roman kings have been attributed to Suetonius' lost *De regibus* (frag. 178 in Reifferscheid 1860: 316–20, with the related 179 on p. 321), but there is no evidence that anything in the *Breviarium* owes anything to Suetonius.
- 2 For a similar analysis, see Trieber 1894. Kyriakidis 2002 is surprisingly unhelpful for this comparison. See also Garstad 2011: 17 for a smaller comparison.
- 3 Note that Eusebius offers one set of figures in the *Chronographia* but does not adhere to them in the *Chronici canones*: Procas reigned twenty-three years in the *Chronographia* and twenty-one in the *Chronici canones*, and Amulius for forty-two in the *Chronographia* and forty-three in the *Chronici canones*. This is not unusual, and such variations can be found for other

be low. However, it is necessary to pin down the names and values in Eusebius: first, so we can know exactly what Eusebius wrote (since his work no longer exists in Greek), and second, so we can determine what Jerome has added to Eusebius' text or changed in it from his Latin sources, which are no longer extant. Instead of footnotes I have chosen to use symbols (*, †, § in that order) and to place the notes at the foot of each table, one in landscape orientation. Normal footnotes are simply too voluminous to place at the foot of a regular vertical page, and the small superscript numbers too easily get lost in the numbers of the tables.

Table 1

<i>Breviarium</i>	Eusebius, <i>Chronogr.</i>	Jerome, <i>Chron. can.</i>	Tzetzes, <i>Sch. in Lyc.</i>	<i>Origo gent. Rom.</i>
		Janus		Janus
		Saturn		Saturn
Picus 38	Picus 37	Picus	Picus	Picus
Faunus 44	Faunus 44	Faunus	Faunus	Faunus
Latinus -	Latinus 36	Latinus*	Latinus	Latinus

Sources: *Breviarium* = ms V; Eusebius, *Chronographia* = Armenian translation, Karst, 136.7–10, 13 = Syncellus, 200.14–17, 20; Jerome, *Chron. can.* 62^c; John Tzetzes, *Scholia in Lycophronem* 1232.16–46 (= Cassius Dio, 1, p. 5); *Origo gentis Romanae* 1–9. For the editions of these works, see ‘Editions’ in the first bibliography.

* Jerome gives these five a total duration of ‘about 150 years’, thus allowing approximately thirty-three years for Janus and Saturn. We can see here that the *Breviarium* follows the Greek tradition of starting with Picus, not the Latin tradition that begins with Janus.

kings as well. The *Chronographia* simply provided the basic raw material that Eusebius used to construct his chronology for the *Canones*, but this material did not constitute his only source of evidence.

Table 2A

Note: Every king after (Postumus) Silvius has Silvius as a *gentilicium*, but these have been omitted for clarity.

<i>Breviarium</i>	Diodorus, <i>Bibl. hist.</i>	Dionysius, <i>Ant. Rom.</i>	Appian, <i>Basilica</i>	Tzetzes, <i>Sch. in Lyc.*</i>
Aeneas 3	Aeneas 3†	Aeneas 3	Aeneas 3	Aeneas
Ascanius 36	Ascanius 38	Ascanius 38	Ascanius 4	Ascanius
Postumus§ Silvius 37	Silvius 49	Silvius 29	Silvius	Silvius
Aeneas 31**	Aeneas 30+	Aeneas 31	Aeneas	Aeneas
Latinus 51	Latinus 50	Latinus 51	Latinus	Latinus
Alba 28	Albas 38	Albas 39		
Appius 41	Epitus 26	Capetus 26		
Capys 28	Apys 28	Capys 28	Capys	Capys
Campeius 21	Calpetus 13	Calpetus 13	Capetus	Capetus
Titus 8	Tiberius 8	Tiberinus 8	Tiberinus	Tiberinus
Agrippa 51	Agripas 41	Agrippas 41	Agropas††	Amulius
	Aramulius 19	Allodius 19	Romulus	
Adventinus 38	Aventius 37	Aventinus 37	Aventinus	Aventinus
Procas 8	Procas 23	Procas 23	Procas	Procas
Amulius 51	Amulius 43	Amulius 42	Amulius	Amulius
Remus 17§§		(Remus 18)		(Remus 18)

Sources: *Breviarium* = ms V; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. hist.* 7.5.2–12 = Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Armenian translation, Karst, 136–9); Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 1.64.1 + 65.1, 70.1, 71.1–4; Appian, *Basilica* 1.1–5 and 1a.1–5; John Tzetzes, *Scholia in Lycophronem*, 1232.44–66 (= Cassius Dio, 1, pp. 5–6).

* Tzetzes is quoted as a fragment from Cassius Dio by Boissevain (Dio's editor) along with Zonaras, whose corrupted list is as follows: Aeneas, Ascanius, Silvius, Aeneas, Latinus, Pastis, Tiberinus, Amulius, Aventinus, unnamed king, Numitor, and Amulius (7.1, p. 4.11–12 and 4.23–5.21). The absence of Albas and Epytus proves that these two lists are indeed closely related.

† For Aeneas' regnal length in Diodorus, the τριετη of the Greek text (= Syncellus 229.18) and Petermann's 'per triennium' (the Latin translation of the Armenian in Schoene 1875: 282.34) show that Karst's translation of the same phrase in the Armenian, 'dreißigjährige', is incorrect (137.3).

§ The name Postumus is otherwise found only in Ovid's *Fasti*, the *Origo*, and Jerome (*Chron. can.* 63^c; 64^{d,e}; 66^b), entries he added from another, Latin, source (see n. ** of Table 2C, below). All three must therefore be depending upon the same Latin tradition.

** A term of thirty-one years for Aeneas Silvius seems to be supported by a statue base from Augustus' historical 'hall of fame' in the Forum of Augustus (Geiger 2008: 131).

†† This name is a corruption of 'Agrippa'. See note *** in Table 2C for a further development of the corruption in Ovid.

§§ Although the *Breviarium* lists this as the length of Remus' reign ('regnauit'), this was in fact originally Remus' age at the time of his death. No other source gives Remus any regnal years (he never ruled Alba Longa), but both Dionysius and Tzetzes explicitly say that Romulus and Remus were eighteen when their identities were exposed or when they founded Rome, which was the same year, and this must be the origin of this figure, which is a simple error of XVII for XVIII (*Ant. Rom.*

1.79.12 and *Schol. in Lycophr.* 1232.86–7). Cf. Jerome's 'cum adoleuissent' (84^b, actually on p. 85) and the *Origo*'s 'ut primum adoleuissent' (21.4), clearly from a related source.

The lists in the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* (pp. 240, 242, and 302) are corrupt almost beyond recognition (both the names and the years): Aeneas (38 years), Ascanius (35), Albas Silvius (36), Tittus Silvius (38), Francus Silvius (53), Latinus Silvius (56), Procnax Silvius (46), Tarc(y)inius Silvius (18), Ciden(s)us Silvius (32), Abintinus Silvius (21), and Rimus Silvius (29). But enough remains, especially the names Titus and Remus, to show that it and the surrounding text are related to the source(s) employed by the compiler of the *Breviarium*. I discuss this list in Burgess 2013: 33–8.

Table 2B*

x = lacuna in text

Eusebius, <i>Chronogr.</i>	Eusebius 1	Eusebius 2	Eusebius, <i>Chron. can.</i> Arm.	Eusebius, <i>Chron. can.</i> Lat.
Aeneas 3	Aeneas 3	Aeneas 3	Aeneas 3	Aeneas 3
Ascanius 38	Ascanius 38	Ascanius 38	Ascanius 38	Ascanius 38
Silvius 28	Silvius 29	Silvus 29	Silvius 29	Silvius 29
Aeneas 31	Aeneas 31	Aeneas 39	Latinus 31	Aeneas 31
Latinus 50	Latinus 44	Latinus 50	Aeneas 50	Latinus 50
Albas 39	Albas 57	Albas 39	Albas 39	Alba 39
Epitus 26	Apytus 26	Epistus 26	Epistus/ Epitus 26	Aegyptus† 24
Capys 28	Capys 28	Capys 28	x/Capys 28	Capys 28
Carpentus 13	Carpentus 13	Carpentus 13	x/Anchises 13	Carpentus 13
Tiberius 8	Tiberius 8	Tiberius 8	Tiberius 8	Tiberinus§ 8
Agripas 35	Agrippas 41	Archippas 41	Agrippas 41	Agrippa 40
Amulios 19	Areaculus 19	Aremulus 19	Aremulus 19	Aremulus 19
Aventius 37	Aventius 30	Aventus 37	Aventus/ Aventius 37	Aventinus 37
Procas 23	Procanus 23	Procas 21	Procas 21	Procas 23
Amulius 42	Amulius 42	Amulus 42	Amulus/ Amulius 43	Amulius 44

Sources: Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Armenian translation, Karst, 139–40); Eusebius 1 = *Syn. chron. A*, 19.19, 27–29; 20.1–6; Eusebius 2 = *Series regum* of the Armenian manuscripts, Karst, 149; Eusebius, *Chronici canones* Arm. = Armenian translation, Karst, 171–82 (first variant) and the Armenian translation of Eusebius by Samuel Aniensis, p. 634 (second variant); Eusebius, *Chronici canones* Lat. = Jerome's Latin translation, pp. 62–88.

* Later lists based on Eusebius somehow became corrupted, as these two Greek lists from Syncellus (200.21, 24; 207.9–18; 216.15–217.3; 226.6–11) and *Chron. syn.* (89.3–20) show, for instance:

Syncellus	<i>Chron. syn.</i>
	Faunus 29
	Latinus 37
Aeneas 3	Aeneas 5
Ascanius 37	Ascanius 39
Silvius 29	Silvius 29
Silvius 31	Aeneas 36
Aeneas 50	Latinus 50
Silvius 30	Anagalbas 40
Anchises 10	Anchises 20
Aegyptius 20	Aegyptus 24
Cappys 34	Capus 28
Tiberius 48	Carpontius 13
Aremulus 19	Tiberius 8
Carmentus 16	Agrippas 49
Silvius 18	Eremulus 19
	Aventius 37
Percas 32	Procanus 23
Amulus 23	Amulus 43

Here we can see the ‘Aegyptus’ for ‘Epytus’ error that also appears in Jerome (see next note) – which must therefore have happened very early in a common Greek manuscript tradition – as well as the mysterious ‘Anchises’ who also appears in the Armenian traditions and the ‘Procanus’ of *Syn. chron. A* (see this table for both). The years are almost completely corrupted.

† This is the same ‘Aegyptus’ for ‘Epytus’ error seen in the last note in much later Greek traditions. Note that Jerome also silently alters several durations: he reduces Aegyptus from twenty-six to twenty-four years and Agrippa from forty-one to forty (–3), and increases Procas from twenty-one to twenty-three (as in the *Chronographia*) and Amulius from forty-three to forty-four (+3). One assumes that these figures are what Jerome found in his Latin source (see Table 2C n. ** below), but apart from the figure for Procas they are otherwise unattested.

§ As we can see from the next table, Jerome silently corrects Eusebius’ incorrect ‘Tiberius’ to ‘Tiberinus’ and ‘Aventius’ to Aventinus’.

Table 2C*

Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> †	Ovid, <i>Metamorph.</i>	Ovid, <i>Fasti</i>	Livy	<i>Origo gent.</i> <i>Rom.</i> §	Jerome, <i>Chron. can.</i> **
Aeneas	Aeneas	Aeneas	Aeneas	Aeneas	Aeneas
	Ascanius	Iulus	Ascanius	Ascanius	Ascanius
Silvius	Silvius	Postumus Silvius	Silvius	Silvius Postumus	Silvius Postumus
Aeneas			Aeneas		Latinus††
	Latinus	Latinus	Latinus	Latinus	Aeneas
	Alba	Alba	Alba		Alba
	Epytus	Epytus	Atys		Atys
Capys	Capys	Capys	Capys		Capys
	Capetus	Capetus	Capetus		(Carpentus)§§
	Tiberinus	Tiberinus	Tiberinus	Tiberius	Tiberinus
	Remulus	Agrippa	Agrippa		Agrippa
	Acrota***	Remulus	Romulus	Aremulus	Remulus†††
	Aventinus	Aventinus	Aventinus	Aventinus	Aventinus
Procas	Proca	Proca	Proca	Procas	Procas
Numitor	Numitor+Amulius	Numitor+Amulius	Amulius	Amulius	Amulius

Sources: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.763–9; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.600, 603, 609–22, 772–3; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.37–53; Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 1.3; *Origo gentis Romanae* 14, 17–19; and Jerome, same as above.

* I have omitted the list from the First Vatican Mythographer (3.11–19, Aeneas, Iulus/Ascanius, Silvius Aeneas, Latinus, Epytus, Capus, Capetus, Remulus, Acrota, Aventinus, Palatinus, and Amulius and Numitor) because the text is tenth or eleventh century and derives from extant Latin texts, particularly the *Metamorphoses* (see Zorzettil and Berlioz 1995: xi–xii).

† Vergil lists just a few of the Alban kings and not in any particular order. I have included his short list here only because it highlights the strange absence of Aeneas (Silvius) in Ovid and the *Origo*.

§ The list of the *Origo* emphasizes continuous succession and is not merely a selection of names: Tiberius is explicitly said to have been Silvius Postumus' son (18.1) and Aremulus is said to have been his successor (18.2). The omissions are so egregious that one suspects corruption in the manuscript tradition.

** The information in this column derives from the material that Jerome has added to Eusebius' text, probably from what he calls a 'Latina historia' (77^c) – which is probably the same work he earlier referred to as 'alia historia' (66^b) – in the form of additional historical entries: 62^c, 63^c, 64^{d,e}, 66^b, 72^c, 74^b, 75^a, 76^b, 77^{b,c}, 79^d, 81^a, 83^c, 84^b (continues to p. 85), and 88^b. He also includes many other details not germane to this discussion. Other changes Jerome made to Eusebius can be seen in Table 1 n. * and Table 2B nn. † and §. See also Mommsen 1850: 689–91.

†† Jerome notes that in 'alia historia' he finds that Latinus Silvius is listed fourth and Aeneas Silvius fifth (*Chron. can.* 66^b). Syncellus and the Armenian tradition also reverse the names, perhaps as a result of changes made to a common manuscript tradition of Eusebius, which may suggest that there is a connection between the two traditions.

§§ This is Eusebius' mistake for the Calpetus listed in his sources, so it cannot have appeared in Jerome's Latin history; but Jerome does not correct it as he does with Atys and Remulus (and even repeats it at 75^a and 76^b), so we cannot be certain what name should appear here.

*** This name is obviously a later variant of the 'Agropas' in Appian (note ** in Table 2A): the voiced 'g' has shifted to an unvoiced 'c' and a pi has been read as a tau, a common error in Greek, the language in which Ovid's source for this name must have been written.

††† Helm's text reads 'Siluius Aremulus' (79^d), which is incorrect. Fotheringham's text reads 'Siluius Aremulus siue Remulus' (p. 135.22), which must be correct, as can be seen from Helm's *apparatus* for 79^a and from Jerome 81^a ('Auentinus Remuli ... filius', Fotheringham, p. 139.4) with Helm's *apparatus*. Also compare Jerome's same method of presenting an alternative in 72^c.

The parallels above allow us to reconstruct a hypothetical original list with its associated major variants as follows (figures in brackets are Jerome's variants):

Picus, 37 years
 Faunus, 44 years
 Latinus, 36 years
 Aeneas, 3 years
 Ascanius, 38 years
 Silvius/Postumus Silvius, 29 years
 Aeneas, 31 years
 Latinus, 50/51 years
 Albas, 38/39 years
 Epytus/Atys, 26 (24) years
 Capys, 28 years
 Calpetus/Capetus, 13 years
 Tiberinus, 8 years
 Agrippa, 41 (40) years
 Remulus/Aremulus, 19 years
 Aventinus, 37 years
 Procas, 21/23 years
 Amulius, 42/43 (44) years

Let us compare these figures in Latin with those from the *Breviarium*. In all but one case we can determine the original figure.

Table 3
 Regnal Lengths of Pre-Roman Kings Compared

Name	Hypothetical Original	<i>Brev.</i>
1. Picus	XXXVII	XXXVIII
2. Faunus	XLIII	XLIII
3. Latinus	XXXVI	—
4. Aeneas	III	III
5. Ascanius	XXXVIII	XXXVI
6. Postumus Silvius	XXVIII	XXXVII
7. Aeneas	XXXI	XXXI
8. Latinus	LI	LI
9. Alba	XXXVIII	XXVIII
10. 'Appius'	XXVI	XLI
11. Capys	XXVIII	XXVIII
12. 'Campeius'	XIII	XXI
13. 'Titus'	VIII	VIII
14. Agrippa	XLI	LI

(14a. Remulus)	XVIII	–
15. Adventinus	XXXVII	XXXVIII
16. Procas	XXIII	VIII
17. ‘Aetmilius’	XXXXII/-III/-III?	LI
18. Remus	XVIII	XVII

Here we can easily see nearly all the possibilities for variation in the transmission of numbers. First of all, we have simple lacunae, where the *Breviarium* preserves no number at all (nos. 3 and 14a). Next, there are the instances where the number has been correctly preserved, a disappointing six out of nineteen, or 31.6% (nos. 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13). There is a larger number of cases where minor corruption has arisen through the loss or addition of certain numbers at the beginning or the end of a figure (nos. 1, 5, 9, 14, 15, 18). And finally, there are a few instances where serious corruption or perhaps transposition has taken place: no. 6, ‘XXVIII’ to ‘XXXVII’; no. 10, ‘XXVI’ to ‘XLI’ = no. 14?; no. 12, ‘XIII’ to ‘XXI’; no. 16, ‘XXIII’ to ‘VIII’ = no. 13?; and no. 17, ‘XXXXII/-III/-III’ to ‘LI’ = no. 8?. Thus just over two-thirds are incorrect one way or another. To this numerical analysis we can add the names: one has been omitted, four have suffered major corruption, and one has a minor orthographical error (‘Adventinus’), so in this case six of nineteen (31.6%) are incorrect. It must be remembered, however, that not all these errors belong to the manuscript or even the original text. For instance, the survival of the list in the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* (see Table 2A, n. §§ above) allows us to see that the error of Titus for Tiberinus, for instance, belonged to a common source. Similar errors led to the change of Epytus to Aegyptus in a tradition that derived from Eusebius and the change from Agrippa(s) to Agropas (Appian) to Acrota (Ovid). This latter error also reveals the peculiar fact that Ovid (or his source) must have derived this name of an Alban king from a Greek source.

This simple comparison can itself stand as an initial warning to anyone who would try to use the data for imperial reigns contained in this text without understanding the context, especially since each regnal duration consists of a set of three numbers, presenting three possibilities for error. We must therefore begin with skepticism.

4. THE MAJOR SOURCES

Before embarking on this study of regnal years, it would be best to give readers a general idea of the sources employed; their dates, language, and genre; and the context of the chronological information that each text provides. The details of the editions used appear in the first bibliography below and I cite the sources here as I do in the body of the text below. More details regarding the relationship of some of these texts will emerge in the analysis below.

Second century

Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum*. Ends with Marcus Aurelius (d. 180). Greek apologetic. Emperor list.

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*. Ends with Commodus (d. 192). Greek apologetic. Emperor list.

Tertullian, *Aduersus Iudaeos*. Written at very end of second century. Latin apologetic. Individually cited regnal lengths, by which I mean (here and below) that the length of each emperor's reign is presented within a discourse or narrative context, or associated with an emperor's name in a chronicle, not as part of a list.

Tertullian, *Apologeticum*. Written at very end of second century. Latin apologetic. Individually cited dates.

Third century

Cassius Dio. Ends in 229. Greek narrative history. Individually cited regnal lengths and dates.

Liber generationis. Ends with Severus Alexander (d. 235). Chronograph. Emperor list.

Commentary. A chronograph is a term I use to describe a chronographic compendium that is usually based upon Old Testament genealogies, regnal lists, and chronological summaries, but can also include such things as episcopal lists, short historical summaries, and detailed analyses of chronologies and of earlier chronological scholarship. See Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 29–30 and 61.

This is a Latin translation of an originally Greek chronograph, the *Συναγωγή χρόνων* (cited in chapter one), that is always said to be the chronicle of Hippolytus. There is no good evidence that Hippolytus ever wrote a chronicle or, even if he did, that the *Liber generationis* is a translation of that work. For this, see Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 366–71.

Fourth century

Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ends in 324. Greek ecclesiastical history. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* and *Chronici canones*. End in 325. Greek chronograph and chronicle. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. For the definition of a chronicle that is used here, see Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 12–57, 59–60.

Both the *Excerpta ex Eusebii chronicis* (*Excerpt. Eus.*) (Greek) and Samuel Aniensis, *Summarium temporum* (Armenian) are cited as direct witnesses to these lost texts, as are two Armenian translations (Karst 1911), while Jerome, in particular, is cited for the *Canones* (see below).

The direct and indirect influence of Eusebius on all later Greek chronological works is enormous, and as a result many later Byzantine works that clearly reveal Eusebius' influence have been excluded from this study. Indeed, a case could be made that even some of the Greek texts that I have included here should have been omitted because of the pervasive influence of Eusebius, but these I have retained because their information can show influence from other interesting traditions and also because it is useful in some cases to see the relationship with Eusebius set out explicitly and to recognize just how pervasive it can be. The structure of my citations (explained below) will make it clear which texts follow Eusebius for any given emperor, and which ones do not. The same can be said for Eusebius' influence on Latin chronography via Jerome (see below), and on Syriac chronography. Since there was no native Syriac chronological tradition during the period covered here, the data on these emperors were derived from Syriac translations of Eusebius, and as a result the relevant sections of important Syriac chronicles such as the *Chronicon ad an. 724* and Ps-Dionysius (the chronicle of Zuqnin) are little more than Syriac epitomes of Eusebius. As a result, they are not cited independently.

Kaisergeschichte (*KG*). A now-lost Latin *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. The original edition of this work was apparently written c. 359, though earlier editions may have existed (changes in the narrative structure could betray the end of an earlier edition or of an important source, we cannot tell). Its evidence is derived from the common witness of Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Festus, the *Epitome de caesaribus*, Jerome's *Chronici canones*, the *Historia Augusta*, and the emperor list of Polemius Silvius. The now-lost *KG* itself seems to have relied upon Suetonius or an augmented witness to Suetonius (covering the emperors to Domitian) and the early-third-century Latin biographer Marius Maximus (covering the emperors to Elagabalus). Its other sources are unknown. Victor and Eutropius are generally believed to have relied almost exclusively on the *KG*, although as we shall see in Appendices 2 and 4 there is evidence from both for the use of other sources. These complicated relationships mean that identifying the *KG*'s figures for regnal lengths among these various sources can be extremely difficult, and all such identifications can only be treated as tentative. This is all set out explicitly in Appendix

2. See also Barnes 1976, Burgess 1993, Bird 1993: xlvii–xlix, Bird 1994: xii–xiv, Burgess 1995a, Burgess 1995b, and Burgess 2005.

There is some anecdotal evidence, not yet fully analysed, to suggest that there may have been a Greek version of the *KG* in circulation early in the Byzantine period that left traces in Byzantine histories; but the pursuit of that problem is far beyond the parameters of this study. See Cameron 2011: 665–8, 685, 687. As a result, the evidence we shall see below that suggests the use of Eutropius by some Byzantine authors may in fact arise from the ultimate use of a Greek version of the *KG*. A more detailed discussion of the *KG* and its witnesses appears in Chapter 7 and Appendix 2.

Aurelius Victor, *Liber de caesaribus*. Ends with Constantius II (d. 361). Latin *breuiarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths. Relies on the *KG*.

Eutropius, *Breviarium*. Ends with Jovian (d. 364). Latin *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths. Relies on the *KG*.

Commentary. The history of Orosius, some often-cited emperor lists included by Mommsen in his *Chronica minora* volumes, and the histories of Paul the Deacon and Landolfus Sagax (who used both Paul and the *Epitome de caesaribus* as sources), all used Eutropius as a major source, and as a result they are not cited below. As a general rule, Mommsen marks known sources in the margins of his editions, and if he has marked any extant source already included in my analysis, I have not included any reference to that work. This is true for references to Jerome as well (see below).

Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*. Ends with Gratian (374). Greek ecclesiastical work. Emperor list.

Eunapius. Began in 270 with Quintillus and ended originally with the death of Valens in 378 and was later continued to 404. Greek narrative history. Individually listed regnal lengths.

Commentary. That there was a common source used directly by Zosimus and the authors of the *Historia Augusta* and the *Epitome de caesaribus*, and indirectly by later Byzantine historians for the third and fourth centuries is generally agreed upon. Who wrote that source is not, though it was certainly not the Roman aristocrat Nicomachus Flavianus: see Barnes 2004: 121–4 and Cameron 2011: 627–90. The identification of this common source still awaits detailed and definitive proof, and so I shall avoid this difficult problem of *Quellenforschung* here simply by following Barnes 1976 and Barnes 1978: 108–25 and using the name of Eunapius to describe this source. Since nothing in the surviving fragments of Eunapius’s history is of use to this study, my use of his name will only be in connection with his use as a common source by the above-named historians.

Jerome, *Chronici canones*. Ends with Valens (d. 378). Latin chronicle. Independently cited regnal lengths. A Latin translation and continuation of Eusebius’ *Chronici canones*.

Commentary. The situation described above for Eusebius also applies to the influence of Jerome’s chronicle on later Latin historiography. As a result, readers will not find any reference to such oft-cited works as the chronicles of

Prosper, Cassiodorus, and Isidore, the *Gallic Chronicle of 511*, the history of Orosius, or a large number of emperor lists included by Mommsen in his *Chronica minora* volumes, since they rely upon Jerome to a greater or lesser degree. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*. Ends with Arcadius and Honorius (392). Greek technical work. Emperor list.

Epitome de caesaribus. Ends with Theodosius I (d. 395). Latin *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. In addition to the *KG* (employed throughout), the *Epitome de caesaribus* used Victor (particularly from the beginning to § 11, Domitian, but for later sections as well), Marius Maximus (for §§ 12–23, Nerva to Elagabalus), and Greek sources (for most of the third and fourth centuries), including in particular the text I refer to as Eunapius from 270 (on whom see above). See Barnes 1976.

Historia Augusta (HA). Ends with Carinus and Numerian (d. 285), but written at the end of the fourth century. Latin narrative biography. Individually cited regnal lengths and dates.

Commentary. The author of the *HA* used some of the same sources as the *Epit. de caes.* as well as others: an unknown biographer (to Commodus); Marius Maximus (to Elagabalus); the Greek historians Herodian (to 238), Dexippus (to 270), and the text I refer to as Eunapius (from 270; see above); as well as the *KG* (from about the end of Maximus). See Barnes 1978.

Sixth century

Zosimus, *New History*. Incomplete. Written during the reign of Anastasius. Greek narrative history. Individually cited regnal length.

Chronographia Scaligeriana. Ends with death of Anastasius (518), but text as a whole compiled during the second quarter of the sixth century. Latin translation of an originally Greek chronograph. Emperor list.

Commentary. This is the work that is otherwise known as the *Excerpta latina barbari* or *Barbarus Scaligeri*. As I demonstrate elsewhere (Burgess 2013), this is in fact a unified work, not a series of excerpts, that was translated in the 780s; and although the translator was probably a ‘Romance’ or Germanic speaker from Francia (perhaps from near Nice) who learned Latin and Greek at Corbie during the second half of the eighth century, he was not the ignoramus that Scaliger made him out to be with his hyperbolic insults.

Malalas. Ends with Justinian (d. 565), though there was an earlier edition. Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. Universal *breviarium* is phrase I use to describe a highly compact narrative history that covers history from the creation of the world and includes the events of the Old Testament and Greek mythology, as distinguished from a normal sort of *breviarium*, like those of Eutropius or Aurelius Victor, for instance, that cover history from a much more recent point in the past or the massive universal histories like those of Ephorus, Timaeus, or Diodorus Siculus that were written in Greek during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Works

like Malalas' are today often referred to as chronicles, but they share nothing with chronicles apart from their brevity.

The text labelled in the analysis below as '(Malalas)' is a seventh-century Latin epitome of Malalas and is only cited for the portion of the original Greek text covering the third century that is missing in a lacuna. This material is printed by Thurn in his edition, pp. 225–7, with supporting parallels from other witnesses.

Seventh century

Chronicon paschale. Ends with Heraclius in 628 and written a few years later.

Greek chronicle and *consularia*.¹ Individually cited regnal lengths.

John of Antioch. Original edition ends with Anastasius (d. 518), but a later continuation extends to the early seventh century. Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. I have not included any of the regnal terms from the *Excerpta Salmasiana*, a Byzantine collection of excerpts from John (see Roberto 2005: liii–lxxvii and Mariev 2008: 16*, 26*–30*), since it is not at all certain whether these derive from the original text of John of Antioch or (as I think) were added later. Many are only noted in the margin of the twelfth-century Vatican manuscript (V) in later hands. They are, at any rate, all derivative.

Liber chronicorum. Ends with Heraclius (d. 641). Latin emperor list. Part of the Merovingian compilation that makes up the first book of the history that goes goes under the name of Fredegarius.

Ninth century

Syncellus, *Ecloga chronographica*. Ends with Carinus and Numerian (d. 285), but written c. 810. Greek chronograph. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Theophanes, *Chronographia*. Starts with Diocletian (284) and ends with Michael I (d. 813). Greek chronicle. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Nicephorus, Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον. Ends with Michael II (d. 829). Greek compact epitome. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. A compact or chronicle epitome is an historical text that can be considered as a universal *breviarium* written as an expanded regnal list. Such a text, therefore, is little more than a list of Biblical patriarchs, judges, and kings, and later kings and emperors with one or two extremely brief, chronicle-like entries attached to many (though by no means all) of the lemmata. They are not chronicles since they have no interest in chronology apart from the length of the rule of each ruler (or life of each Biblical patriarch), and they are not universal *breviaria* since there is no narrative, they are extremely short (a few tens of pages in a modern edition), and are almost always completely derived from a few pre-existing works. See Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 32, 62

1 For *consularia*, a native form of Roman chronicle dated by consuls and written in a distinctive style, see Chapter 6 n. 8 and Appendix 4 n. 7.

George the Monk, *Chronographia*. Ends with Theophilus (d. 842), but written at a slightly later date. Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Chron. syn. (Χρονογραφείον σύντομον). Ends with Michael III (d. 867). Greek chronograph. Emperor list.

Anonymus matritensis. Ends with Basil I (d. 886). Greek compact epitome. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Tenth century

Symeon the Logothete. Ends with Constantine VII (d. 959). Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths. This work has in the past been quoted and cited from the work of the later continuators Leo Grammaticus, Theodosius Melitenus, Georgius Continuatus (see Wahlgren 2006: 132–3*), and the text found in Cramer 1839: 166–381, but we now have an edition of the original work (Wahlgren 2006).

Eleventh century

Syn. chron. B (Σύνοψις χρονική). Ends with Romanus III Argyrus (d. 1034). Greek compact epitome. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Twelfth century

Cedrenus. Ends with Michael VI (d. 1057), but written in the twelfth century. Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Zonaras, *Annales*. Ends with Alexis I (d. 1118). Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. Down to the beginning of the third century Zonaras used Cassius Dio and an epitome of Dio made by Xiphilinus (see Chapter 6 n. 7 and Appendix 1 n. 5). Nevertheless, because of Zonaras' overall importance as a source (and interesting variants) I always cite him independently.

Chron. epit. (Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον). Ends with John II (d. 1143). Greek compact epitome. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Thirteenth century

Syn. chron. A (Σύνοψις χρονική). Ends with John IV and Michael VIII (d. 1261). Greek universal *breviarium*. Individually cited regnal lengths.

Commentary. This work is usually attributed to Theodorus Scuteriotes, but there is no good evidence to connect him with it: see *ODB*, pp. 1912–13. It is also referred to by the name of its modern editor, Constantine Sathas.

5. THE ROMAN EMPERORS FROM JULIUS CAESAR TO LICINIUS

The sort of analysis we saw in Chapter 3 is fine where we know what the original figure for the length of a ruler's reign is supposed to be. But in cases where we do not have this information, we cannot guess what type of error, if any, has taken place. This is a problem, since the *Breviarium* is at its most valuable for the periods when we do not know the lengths of the emperors' reigns, particularly in the third century. Furthermore, there are additional complications, beyond those we have seen in above in Chapters 2 and 3. First of all, any figure given by the *Breviarium* may in fact correctly reflect what the original compiler wrote, but that figure may already have been corrupted in his source, or it may represent a variant tradition, different from what we would expect to find. Second, we do not know in any particular case whether the duration of an emperor's reign was calculated inclusively or normally (these terms will be explained below). Third, we do not know if the calculation from the dates of accession and death was done correctly, whether by the *Breviarium*'s compiler or by one of his sources. Fourth, we do not know whether those dates employed to calculate the figures were accurate or not. As we shall see in Appendix 1, even an historian of the calibre of Cassius Dio could get the lengths of a number of reigns wrong because he was calculating them from incorrect dates. Fifth, we do not know if any duration was reckoned from the original proclamation by the troops, the date of the death of the previous emperor, or the official proclamation by the senate, and at the other end of the reign whether it was reckoned to the proclamation of the next emperor by his troops, the emperor's death, or the official proclamation by the senate of the next emperor. This can be particularly important in the third century, where there is so much overlap of reigns. And finally, we have no way of knowing whether the compiler just invented the figures for the number of months or (especially) days in a reign if he could not find the data he needed. His rigid method that necessitated years, months, and days did not allow room for a lack of knowledge. All we can do is compare each figure to the figures in other literary sources in the hopes that the compiler relied on sources that are reflected in other surviving evidence.

I must now explain how Roman historians calculated these year, month, and day figures.¹ Let us assume Emperor X became emperor on 28 May 36 and died on 6 July 57, or rather, to be more realistic, *V kal. Iun. Allenio et Plautio coss. and prid. non. Iul. Nerone II et Pisone coss.* Our putative Roman historian would first need a consular list that had had the consuls enumerated from some point. Many lists must

1 I have taken the trouble to rehearse these calculation methods in detail because not everyone knows how to convert Roman dates into modern dates (and *vice versa*) and because this type of year/month/day figure has recently come under attack as a 'pseudo-accurate chronographic style' (McCarthy 1998: 119 n. 61).

have already had their consular pairs (= years) counted, with the total number of years recorded every fifty or ten years or even annually, as we can see from the surviving *Descriptio consulum* and the *consularia* of the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* and *Chronographia Golenischevensis*, which count the years from the first consuls and, in the case of the latter two, from the beginning of the Egyptian Diocletianic era, which began in 284, as well. Then he would have to subtract the number associated with the earlier consuls from the number for the later consuls. This is twenty-one years, from *V kal. Iun.* (28 May) 36 to *V kal. Iun.* (28 May) 57. He would next move to the months. He would then count one month from *V kal. Iun.* to *V kal. Iul.* Finally come the days, from *V kal. Iul.* to *prid. non. Iul.* For us, and for any Greek who had the days in a Greek form, which was exactly like ours, with a sequential count of days from the beginning of the month, this is a simple matter ($[30 - 28] + 6 = 2 + 6 = 8$ days), but *V kal. Iul.* cannot easily be subtracted from *prid. non. Iul.* So our historian would be faced with two calculations: one to work out the remaining days in June, and the other to work out the elapsed days in July. The first calculation, for the date with the kalends, is undertaken in the following way. Romans counted the days in the second half of a month from the kalends of the following month. They also counted inclusively, by which I mean that they counted the date at the beginning of the counted sequence. Since *V* = 28 in our example above, then *IIII* = 29, *III* = 30, *II* = 31, and *I* = 1. Since both the twenty-eighth and the first are counted in this pre-kalends calculation, we need to drop them to determine the number of days remaining in the month. Thus we must subtract two from the given number (here *V*) to find the number of days remaining in any month. This gives us the calculation of $5 - 2 = 3$. The second calculation, for the nones date, is the normal method for calculating the modern equivalent of a Roman date: the given number (here *pridie* = 2) minus one (to compensate for inclusive counting) subtracted from the date of the nones in the month under consideration (in July it is 7): $7 - (2 - 1) = 6$. Adding three and six together, we get nine days, which is one day more than we would get if we simply counted from 28 June to 6 July, as we calculated it above.

Here we are immediately confronted with the great insight of Walter Snyder's 'Roman date' observation with respect to the figures given by Cassius Dio (Snyder 1940a). In the calculation above we would count the number of days between 28 June and 6 July, for eight days. A Roman would instead calculate from *V kal. Iun.* to *V kal. Iul.* But while May has thirty-one days, June has only thirty. So while *V kal. Iun.* is 28 May, *V kal. Iul.* is 27 June, not 28 June. Any calculation using a Roman date that shifts from a month with thirty-one days to a month with thirty days therefore adds an extra day to the count. Conversely, if we were shifting a date founded on a month with thirty days to one founded on a month with thirty-one days, the Roman count would be one day short.² Romans would run into similar problems when comparing dates based on the nones or ides of months with differing counts (7 and 15 in March, May, July, and October; 5 and 13 in all other months). In these cases, the difference would be plus or minus two days. However, Roman

2 Thus 27 June to 3 September is two months and seven days (27 June to 27 August = 2 months + $[31 - 27] = 4 + 3 = 7$), but *V kal. Iul.* to *III non. Sept.* is two months and six days (*V kal. Iul.* to *V kal. Sept.* = 2 months + $(5 - 2) + 3 = 6$).

historians and compilers knew about these problems, and the fact that such errors are almost never encountered outside of Dio shows that virtually everyone must have known how to compensate for the differences.

We must now proceed with some explication of vocabulary. An ‘exclusive’ count of a regnal length excludes both the beginning and the end days. Thus if Emperor X became emperor on 2 July 36 and died on 10 August 38, an exclusive calculation would set his reign at two years, one month, and seven days, with only the third to the ninth of August being counted. This is a peculiar system to be sure, but Snyder allows that at least six figures in Dio may have arisen from exclusive calculation, although he has his doubts (1940a: 55–6). This possibility will be discussed below. A ‘compensative’ count, as Snyder would call it, would yield eight days, since it is just the result of subtraction (10–2). An ‘inclusive’ count includes the days at both the beginning and the end, and so would count nine days in this example. It is usually assumed that Romans and especially Greeks always calculated inclusively, since they tended to count that way. As we shall see, this is not true. Snyder took the term ‘compensative’ from Holzapfel (‘kompensativ’; see, e.g., Holzapfel 1912: 483–4), but it is not a usual English word in this sense. In the present analysis, this ‘subtractive method’ I shall simply call ‘normal’, since subtraction is the normal way we determine the time between two dates. Let us now turn to the analysis.

The analysis below is broken down by emperor. The structure for each emperor is the same. First comes the paragraph number from the edition in Appendix 3 below, the emperor’s name, and the length of the reign that the *Breviarium* lists for that emperor. This is followed by a symbol indicating the results of each analysis and thus the accuracy of the figures:

* = accurate

*† = accurate report of erroneous tradition

† = apparent minor corruption

†† = apparent minor corruption of erroneous tradition

= major corruption.

§ = accuracy unknown, but probably close. These are cases where we have no other detailed evidence against which to compare a figure, but the *Breviarium*’s figure seems reasonably close to the actual regnal length, based only on years and months, as well as it can be determined today.

§# = accuracy unknown, but probably completely wrong.

The difference between minor and major corruption is not only how many figures of the three (years, months, days) are corrupt, but also the ease of the error (e.g. ‘VI’ to ‘III’ (minor) vs. ‘VI’ to ‘VIII’ [major]) and the magnitude of the error (e.g. ‘I’ for ‘II’ (minor) ‘I’ for ‘XIII’ [major]), especially for the years figure.

The next section is ‘Accepted Chronology’, which presents the accepted dates of accession and death for each emperor, and a duration that I have calculated myself from those dates. The normal and inclusive calculations are separated by a slash (e.g. ‘two/three days’), the inclusive always being the second, longer figure. As an aid to the reader, I have included the source(s) of the dates offered, since there is no modern work known to me that provides the sources of these dates for all the em-

perors (not Kienast, surprisingly enough). Where there are multiple sources (and this is rarer than one might think), I include only a few of the most authoritative. Where these dates are the result of extrapolation from the figures under consideration, I have noted this as well. Since Barnes 1982 is very careful to list all the sources for his dates, for the period from Diocletian onward, I simply cite his work once and not the sources themselves. Where relevant, I have included references to the work of Holzapfel, Snyder, and Murison.

Next follow one or two sections, usually headed 'Relevant Chronologies' and 'Other Chronologies'. The first section contains groups of figures that seem to be related to the *Breviarium*'s figure or to the correct chronology. This is therefore a collection of the most relevant or important figures for the analysis. This section will only appear if any other chronologies are in fact relevant. The 'Other Chronologies' contains the remaining texts. While these are of no direct value for the analysis, they provide us with other examples of figures, usually corrupted in some way, and these offer us many other examples of how numbers can be corrupted. Within the 'Relevant Chronologies' section, the durations are listed according to the manner in which the traditions are related to each other, in order for those relationships to be seen more easily. They are listed in declining numerical order, from the longest duration to the shortest. Since the sources themselves rarely make any distinction between cardinal and ordinal numbers (for example, 'for six years' and 'in the sixth year', which are quite different, can appear for the same emperor in different sources), I have included both together as cardinal numbers without distinction. The witnesses are listed after each duration in chronological order. Texts that are independent of one another are separated by a semi-colon; those that are directly or indirectly dependent on the first source named are separated by a comma. This latter grouping of source dependence takes precedence over chronological order, so a block of related texts separated by commas may begin with a work from the fourth century and extend to the twelfth century, and then be followed by a semi-colon and a citation from a work of the sixth century that is not related to the earlier group (or cannot be proven to be related to it). This method of punctuation with commas is independent of the use of commas within each citation (such as, for instance, 'Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 157' and 'Nicephorus 91.8, 15–16', which would normally be separated by semi-colons), so readers will need to be careful to note that each citation extends from name to name, not comma to comma. Specific short commentaries are appended to the end of the relevant durations where necessary. A general commentary follows at the end; it discusses the various texts or traditions first, and then offers a final evaluation of the numbers of the *Breviarium*'s chronology.

A complete list of the literary texts and editions cited in short-hand below appears in Chapter 4 above and in the first bibliography, in the latter of which readers will also find the specific method of citation for each text and information on other texts mentioned elsewhere in this volume, since many readers will not be familiar with them. The bibliography does not include classical texts, which can easily be found in many different editions. The epigraphic calendars cited below can be found, with introductions and commentaries, in Degraffi 1963 (see 'D' in the list of abbreviations, above, for the method of citation).

Before the reign of Maximinus Thrax, I have not (except in one or two interesting cases) noted when any source gives simply a round number of years, as that would do nothing but add to the bulk of what is already a very long analysis. However, between 235 and 285 I include all the evidence from all the sources, including round numbers of years, since evidence is so scarce. After the reign of Diocletian, I cite no further ancient sources, since they become so confused and contradictory, and no source provides us with any useful or detailed information for those emperors. This phenomenon is in itself worthy of note: the chronology of the emperors of the early fourth century is generally more corrupted and inaccurate in the surviving historical traditions than that of the emperors of the third century, no doubt because of the multiple, frequently changing, overlapping reigns; the wide distribution of the emperors' territories; and the treatment of some *augusti* as usurpers or caesars by others, which not only created confusion as to who became *augustus* when, but it also restricted the amount of chronological information in circulation at the time and thus to survive to later historians.

The major problem that I have discovered while conducting my analysis, especially for the third century, is that there are many instances where the evidence of the *Breviarium* has been used to arrive at modern chronologies. As a result, the evidence of the *Breviarium* ends up looking much more accurate than it perhaps is. In some cases, like Geta and Severus, this influence is obvious, and I have explained the problem in detail. In other cases, especially for the third century, it lies hidden in the tralatitious traditions of scholarship, and so although recent analyses may not make direct reference to it, the evidence of the *Breviarium* still lurks in the background of a previous influential scholar's chronology. I have not traced the evolution of the chronology for every single emperor in the third century (or earlier) to determine how influential the *Breviarium*'s evidence is in that particular case, but every reader must be aware of this potential pitfall.

Finally, I must note that this is not an historical study, but rather an historiographical study. I am interested chiefly in what the sources say happened rather than what actually happened. So when I say, 'Nero committed suicide on 9 June', or 'Maximinus Thrax was proclaimed emperor by the senate on 23 March', I am delivering the verdict of the sources. Historians must then take any such statement and weight it against any other evidence that may exist to determine its historical accuracy.

35. Julius Caesar: three years, seven months, and six days *

Accepted Chronology. There is no accepted chronology, since Caesar was never an emperor. Yet if we count the *Breviarium*'s figures back from 15 March 44 BC, we end up at 9 August 48 BC, the date of the battle of Pharsalus (*Fasti Allifani* [D 24, p. 181], *Fasti Amiternini* [D 25, p. 191], and *Fasti Antiates ministrorum* [D 26, p. 208]). As we shall see, other ancient historians counted from this point as well. Thus 9 August 48 BC to 15 March 44 BC yields a term of three years, seven months, and six/seven days.

Relevant Chronologies

Three years, four months, and six days: Theophilus;³ Clement. The month figure here, and in *Syn. chron. B* below, would seem to be an error that derives from a common Latin source, ‘VII’ read as ‘III’.

Four years, four months, and seven days: *Syn. chron. B* 16.3. The four years is no doubt the result of influence from Eusebius’ date (see below). The seven is probably an error for six rather than the result of inclusive reckoning.

Other Chronologies

Four years and eight months: *Syn. chron. A* 24.15. No doubt a corruption of the following.

Four years and seven months: Eusebius *Chronographia* (Karst, 61.23; see Karst’s note 103 on p. 251) and *Chron. can.* 156, *Chron. pasch.* 354.18–19, Nicephorus 91.6, *Anon. matr.* 44.6, Symeon the Logothete 49.2, Cedrenus 299.20, *Chron. epit.* 21.11.

Three years and seven months: Josephus, *Jewish War* 1.218, *Excerpt. Eus.* 159.23.

Three years and six months: Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.270. This is almost certainly an error for seven months rather than a variant tradition counting from a different date. It is the *Jewish War* figure that is correct, as we shall see is the case below with a variant date for Tiberius as well.

Commentary

Eusebius’ figure is an error that arises because Eusebius assigns Caesar’s first year to the year of Pharsalus (= our 48 BC), and his famous assassination to its correct year, which is our 44 BC. The latter should be Augustus’ first year, since Eusebius treats each regnal year as a regular civic year and otherwise assigns an emperor’s first year to the year of his accession and his last year to the year before the actual year of his death.⁴ Here he gives Caesar five regnal years (= our 48 to 44 BC inclusive), which forces him to bump up his regnal-year total to match. As we shall see below, he compensated for this additional year for Caesar by subtracting a year from Augustus’ reign. The figure in the *Excerpt. Eus.* should be from Eusebius’ *Chronographia*, which is wrong by a year, as we saw, but it must have been corrected by the compiler from Josephus, who agrees with the *Breviarium* (minus the days) and so is also counting from the battle of Pharsalus.

The *Breviarium* is therefore not only perfectly correct but is the only fully detailed, accurate source we possess.

36. Augustus: fifty-six years, four months, and one day *†

Accepted Chronology. Today Augustus’ reign is usually counted from either 31 or 27 BC (Dio too counts from 31; see below), but that was not usually the case in antiquity. We might, on the other hand, expect a count from 7 January 43 BC, the

3 It should be made clear that in his edition Grant ‘corrected’ a large number of figures so that they matched modern consensus. I report the manuscript readings only, not Grant’s emended text, which, as we shall see, is usually wrong.

4 Burgess 1999: 29–30, 36 n. 1.

first time Augustus took up the *fascēs* (*Feriale Cumanum* [D 44, p. 279] and *Fasti Praenestini* [D 17, p. 113; supplemented from *Fer. Cum.*]), which yields fifty-six years, seven months, and twelve/thirteen days. But it is clear that the *Breviarium* is counting (incorrectly) from the day of Augustus' first imperial salutation, 16 April 43 BC (Ovid, *Fasti* 4.673–6; the date in the *Feriale Cumanum* is a supplement from Ovid) to his death on 19 August AD 14 (*Fasti Amiternini* [D 25, p. 191]; *Fasti Antiatensium ministrorum* [D 26, p. 208]; *Fasti Ostienses* 40; Suet., *Aug.* 100.1), which yields a term of fifty-six years, four months, and three/four days.

Relevant Chronologies

Fifty-six years, four months, and one day: Theophilus.

Forty-six years, four months, and one day: Clement. The forty is an obvious scribal error of 'Mζ' for 'Nζ'.

Other Chronologies

Fifty-seven years, six months, and two days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.168 and *Jewish Antiquities* 18.32, Malalas 10.7 (Slavic translation), *Syn. chron. B* 16.5–6.

Fifty-six years and six months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 157, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 346 and *Ancoratus* 1, *Chron. pasch.* 360.4, Nicephorus 91.8, 15–16, *Chron. syn.* 100.28, *Anon. matr.* 44.10, *Syn. chron. A* 24.24.

Forty-four years lacking thirteen days: Dio 56.30.5, Zonaras 10.38, p. 429.5 (days missing).

Commentary

Josephus' figure is counting from the assassination of Julius Caesar and extends to 16 September, which seems wrong but is not, as we shall see below in § 37.

Eusebius' figure is from Josephus, as was his figure for Caesar, but it has been reduced by one year to account for the extra year attributed to Caesar's reign (see above). The derivation is proven by the common count from 15 March 44 BC to 16 September AD 14 in both Josephus and Eusebius. The length of time between the death of Caesar and the actual death of Augustus was fifty-seven years, five months, and four/five days.

Dio explicitly says he is counting from Actium, and his figure is correct if we understand how he calculated it (see Appendix 1 § 5.1, below). Forty-four years was also mentioned in the *KG* as the duration of Augustus' sole rule (= Aur. Victor 1.2, Eutr. 7.8.2, and *Epit. de caes.* 1.30), which is counted from the same year. Eutropius and the *Epit. de caes.* also mention that he ruled with Antony for twelve years and give the total of fifty-six years, the usual full-year figure one sees for Augustus.

The *Breviarium* is two days short, the result of some type of corruption in the figure or the dates used for calculation. The same error appears in Theophilus and Clement, and so the mistake belongs to the tradition, not the *Breviarium*. As a result, although the figures appear to be incorrect when compared to a modern calculation, it turns out that the *Breviarium* is an accurate witness to an erroneous tradition. We therefore have four quite different traditions involving the length of Augustus' rule (Josephus, Theophilus, Dio, Eusebius) because of the different beginning and ending dates.

37. Tiberius: twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-eight days *†

Accepted Chronology: 17 September 14 (modern extrapolation from Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.10.8 and 11–14, and *Fasti Amiternini* [D 25, p. 193], *Fasti Antiates ministrorum* [D 26, p. 209], and *Fasti Viae dei Serpenti* [D 27, p. 215]) to 16 March 37 (*Fasti Ostienses* 43, Suet., *Tib.* 73.1), which yields twenty-two years, five months, and twenty-seven/eight days.

However, in this case there is some modern controversy not only concerning the date of Tiberius' *dies imperii* (see most recently Pettinger 2012: 157–217, esp. 161–2, 202–7, and 237, where an unfortunate typographic error has confused the all-important dates), but even as to whether he had a *dies imperii* at all as the term was later understood (see Levick 1999: 48–59). We must therefore also consider 19 August 14 (the death of Augustus) to 16 March 37, which yields a term of twenty-two years, six months, and twenty-five/six days.

Relevant Chronologies

Twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-eight days: Tertullian, *Adu. Iud.* 8.16.

Twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-two days: *Lib. gen.* 379. The seven months marks this as a corruption of Tertullian's tradition. The *Lib. gen.* was a Greek work that was translated into Latin, and the shift from twenty-eight to twenty-two would have been easier in the Greek original: 'KH' to 'KB'.

Other Chronologies

Twenty-six years, six months, and nineteen days: Clement. The twenty-six is an odd error in Greek or Latin for twenty-two, as is nineteen for twenty-five or -six.

Twenty-three years: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 171, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 348 and *Ancoratus* 2, Nicephorus 92.7, George the Monk 311.16, *Chron. syn.* 100.29, *Anon. matr.* 47.3, *Chron. epit.* 22.32; *Lib. chron.* 432.25.

Twenty-two years, seven months, and seven days: Dio 58.28.5, Zonaras 11.3, p. 445.2–3. Dio misdates Tiberius' death to 26 March (see Appendix 1 § 1.1, below), which from 19 August yields twenty-two years, seven months, and seven/eight days, thus confirming his calculation.

Twenty-two years and seven months: Symeon the Logothete 51.2. This derives ultimately from Dio.

Twenty-two years, six months, and three days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.180.

Twenty-two years, five months, and three days: Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18.224. As was the case with Caesar, the difference here likely originated in scribal corruption rather than counting from different dates; as we shall see below, it is the figure in the *Jewish War* that is correct, as was the case with Augustus. For some reason modern scholars tend to accept the five months, even though the date it points to cannot be right.

Twenty-two years and five months: *Syn. chron.* A 27.19. Probably from Josephus.

Twenty-two years: Theophilus; Malalas 10.7, *Chron. pasch.* 388.7; Syncellus 386.18; *Syn. chron.* B 16.7.

Commentary

It is impossible to know why so many sources that give months and even days for other first-century emperors give only years for Tiberius, some rounding up to twenty-three, others rounding down to twenty-two.

As we saw above, Augustus' duration figure in Josephus extends to 16 September. As we can now see, this is counting to the accession of Tiberius. Six months (not five) will take us from September to March, and three days from 16 March will take us to 18 March (the day of Caligula's accession; see below) if we count inclusively, as Josephus does. Thus both of Josephus' figures (for Augustus and Tiberius) are correct when it is realized that he is counting inclusively to and from 16 September, and thence to the day of Caligula's accession. Josephus' figures thus show that the modern consensus date for Tiberius' accession was also regarded by Josephus' source (at least) as his *dies imperii*, though the day is off by one: *XVI kal. Oct.* instead of *XV kal. Oct.* For some reason no one (to my knowledge) has correctly interpreted Josephus' data with regard to Augustus and Tiberius.

In view of the above, the twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-eight days of Tertullian, the *Lib. gen.*, and the *Breviarium* is most likely the result of an inclusive count between 19 August, the death of Augustus, and 18 March, the *dies imperii* of Caligula, which is twenty-two years, six months, and twenty-eight days. In this case the seven months would be an error for six. This could be a scribal error, but it is more likely the result of influence from a duration that counted a rounded twenty-two years and seven months, though we cannot be certain. We shall see below a number of other more certain examples of variant traditions influencing one another.

The two observations noted above regarding Josephus and Tertullian/*Lib. gen.*/*Breviarium* raise new problems for our understanding of these figures. We would assume that all such duration figures would count from an emperor's *dies imperii* to his death. But in the real world it would have been easier to calculate between the *dies imperii* of one emperor and the *dies imperii* of his successor, since such dates were well-known, and at the time, at least, most accessions were celebrated every year. Copies of old *ferialia* would provide evidence for the dates of emperors, such as Caligula, whose *feriae publicae* were abolished after his death. Furthermore, it looks as though differing traditions could influence one another, in this case twenty-two years, six months, and twenty-eight days being influenced by twenty-two years and seven months. More evidence for this type of error will be presented below.

On the other hand, the duration figures of Tertullian, Clement, and Dio show that when a death date was well known, as is the case with Augustus' death or Tiberius', it and not the *dies imperii* of the successor could be used for the calculation.

This suggests that the general assumption among historians at the time was that emperors succeeded one another on the same day, so the death date for one emperor and the *dies imperii* for his successor would have been the same, and either could be used for calculation. Thus in cases where stated durations end at and begin from the same date, we cannot be certain that this necessarily implies that one emperor

was actually proclaimed on the same day as the death of his predecessor. We shall see further evidence of this problem below.

These figures also prove that Dio was not perfect. He could make mistakes; or, rather, in this case, he did not catch the mistakes of his sources, since almost certainly his error arises from a haplography in his source: the date was written as *VII kal. Apr.* instead of *XVII kal. Apr.* The implications of this demonstrable error for Dio's other apparent errors have not until now been sufficiently taken into account by scholars, as we shall see in Appendix 1, below.

Again, the chronology of the *Breviarium* appears to be incorrect but is actually a correctly reported variant tradition, itself already corrupt, which counts from Augustus' death to Caligula's accession.

38. Caligula: three years, eight months, and twelve days ††

Accepted Chronology: 18 March 37 (*Acta fratrum Arvalium*, *CIL* 6.2028, s. a. 38) to 24 Jan. 41 (Suet., *Cal.* 58.1), which yields a term of three years, ten months, and six/seven days.

Relevant Chronologies

Three years, eight months, and thirteen days: Tertullian, *Adu. Iud.* 8.16. As was the case with Tiberius, we have an error in Tertullian's months figure that appears in another tradition (Theophilus, below, who is earlier). Here the error of 'VIII' for 'X' (or 'I' to 'H' in Greek) is very difficult to explain palaeographically.

Three years, eight months, and seven days: Theophilus. This is probably what Tertullian's duration originally looked like (an inclusive seven days).

Three years and eight months: Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.204 and *Jewish Antiquities* 19.201, *Syn. chron. B* 16.11, *Syn. chron. A* 28.14. Josephus is probably the ultimate source for the latter two (see Augustus and Tiberius). The eight months proves that this duration, too, is related to that of Theophilus/Tertullian.

Other Chronologies

Four years and seven months: Malalas 10.17.

Three years, ten months, and eight days: Suet., *Cal.* 59.1, *KG* (= Eutropius, 7.12.4); Clement. This is calculated from Tiberius' death on 16 March, not Caligula's accession, and is exactly correct.

Three years and ten months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 177, mss HK of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 83, line 2), Nicephorus 92.18, *Anon. matr.* 47.18; *Lib. chron.* 432.26. This is a rounded version of the correct duration.

Three years, nine months, and twenty-nine/twenty-two days: Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 350 and *Ancoratus* 3. The former is the correct reading of Dio's figure (see below), the latter a corrupted variant ('B' for 'Θ').

Three years, nine months, and twenty-eight days: Dio 59.30.1, John of Antioch 112, p. 190.11, Zonaras 11.7, p. 459.1–2. This has been calculated from 26 March (see Tiberius, above) and is incorrect (it is short one day: see Epiphanius above and Appendix 1 § 9.1, below).

Three years and nine months: *Lib. gen.* 380; Symeon the Logothete 52.2. The latter is from Dio. In the former, the nine may be an error for eight, and thus be related to the Josephus/Theophilus/Tertullian duration.

Three years and four months: *Chron. syn.* 100.30.

Commentary

Without the *Acta* of the Arval Brethren and the durations from Josephus, Tertullian, and the *Lib. gen.* for Tiberius, we would have no hint that Caligula's *dies imperii* was two days after Tiberius' death. Again we have calculations based on the death date of the previous emperor (Suetonius and Clement), not the *dies imperii* of the emperor in question.

The *Breviarium* is too short by almost two months, but the figure is very close to the Josephus/Theophilus/Tertullian figure, which indicates that all derive from a common original. The *Breviarium* is reporting either a corruption of Tertullian's days figure ('XII' for 'XIII') or a transitional figure between that of Theophilus and Tertullian (VII → XII → XIII).

39. Claudius: thirteen years, eight months, and twenty-seven days ††

Accepted Chronology: 24 Jan. 41 (date of Caligula's death, confirmed by historical narratives of the events) to 13 Oct. 54 (Suet., *Claud.* 45, Dio 60.34.3), which yields a term of thirteen years, eight months, and nineteen/twenty days.

Relevant Chronologies

Thirteen years, eight months, and twenty-eight days: Clement; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 179; *Chron. syn.* 100.31.

Thirteen years, one month, and twenty-eight days: *Lib. gen.* 381; Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 350–1 ('thirteen years and two months lacking two days'). The one month is an unusual corruption for the 'eight', but the *Lib. gen.*'s duration for Nero is a dittography of this figure and the eight appears there, confirming its original appearance here.

Twenty-three years, eight months, and twenty-four days: Theophilus. The 'twenty-three' is an obvious error for 'thirteen', but 'twenty-four' is an unusual error for 'twenty-eight' (in either Latin or Greek). This is related to the duration of Clement/Eusebius and the original of *Lib. gen.*/Epiphanius.

Other Chronologies

Fourteen years and nine months: Malalas 10.22. This is no doubt an error for the figure in Cedrenus and *Syn. chron. A* (below).

Thirteen years and ten months: *Lib. chron.* 432.27.

Thirteen years and nine months: Nicephorus 92.19; Cedrenus 346.14; *Syn. chron. A* 28.18. This is a rounded version of the correct figure.

Thirteen years, eight months, and twenty days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.248 and *Jewish Antiquities* 20.148, *Syn. chron. B* 16.13; Dio 60.34.3, Zonaras 11.11, p. 473.5–6. This is correct.

Thirteen years and eight months: Eusebius, *HE* 2.19.2; ms C of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 84, line 2). This is a truncated version of the correct figure.

Thirteen years, seven months, and twenty days: Tertullian, *Adu. Iud.* 8.16.⁵ This is a correct inclusive count except for the simple error of ‘VII’ for ‘VIII’.

Thirteen years and five months: Symeon the Logothete 53.2.

Commentary

Unusually, the texts that normally follow Eusebius report only thirteen or fourteen years.

There is no way to explain the consistent error of twenty-eight/-seven/-four days for nineteen/twenty apart from dittography and consequent corruption. By this I mean that the twenty-eight was originally mistakenly copied from Nero’s total in a common source (see below), which is not surprising given the similarity of the two chronologies. This is not the only example of this phenomenon, as we shall see, and indeed in the very next reign we shall see the opposite, with Claudius’ total copied for Nero’s (where Claudius’ figure is already a result of earlier dittography from Nero’s). This implies that this original source was simply a list, where such dittography could easily occur, rather than a narrative account.

Although the *Breviarium* appears to be incorrect, the other evidence strongly suggests that ‘XXVIII’ was undoubtedly the original figure and that the *Breviarium* has only lost a ‘-I’. It is a minor corruption.

40. Nero: fourteen years, five months, and twenty-eight days

Accepted Chronology: 13 Oct. 54 (Claudius’ death) to 9 June 68 (extrapolation), which yields a term of thirteen years, seven months, and twenty-seven/eight days.

Suetonius does not give the date of Nero’s death (as a calendar date, at any rate), and so the date must be extrapolated from reign-length chronologies. The standard and accepted date for Nero’s suicide is 9 June (Kienast, 97), though not without some doubt. The duration from Eusebius-Jerome, counted inclusively, takes us to 9 June. Josephus’ figure of seven months and seven days for Galba, counted backwards inclusively (as we would expect for Josephus) from Galba’s death (on 15 January 69 [see below]), also indicates 9 June. Dio’s one year and twenty-two days (66.17.4), counted between Nero’s death and Vespasian’s accession on 1 July, indicates 9 June if counted normally (as we would expect: it is calculated according to Method 3 in Appendix 1). Theophilus and Tertullian count seven months and six days for Galba’s reign (*Ad Aut.* 3.27 and *Adu. Iud.* 8.16), which is correct if counted normally from 9 June 68 to 15 January 69. An inclusive count covering the same period is provided by Josephus and Aurelius Victor (see

5 This duration is missing from the two earliest witnesses to the text of *Aduersus Iudaeos* (Φ/Q and φ/q, collation notes from a lost Fulda manuscript published as an appendix to an edition of 1597; and Parisinus Latinus 13047, an incomplete text from the early eighth century) but does appear in manuscripts PTNFX (P of the early eleventh century, T of the twelfth, and the remainder of the fifteenth). Tränkle omits it from his edition, but it can hardly be a pre-eleventh-century interpolation, since at that date such an interpolation would almost certainly have come from Jerome, who has something different for this duration. Furthermore, I doubt that Tertullian would really have omitted Claudius. There can be little doubt, therefore, that this duration was originally part of the text and has simply been lost from the φ/q tradition.

below). A date of 9 June is therefore the best fit for all this evidence, as well as for the many sources that report twenty-seven or twenty-eight days (noted below). The evidence cited by Reece 1969, which indicates 11 June, is insufficient to overturn the agreement of these sources (whose figures he miscounts in some cases). See Holzapfel 1912: 484–89 and 1918: 119.

Relevant Chronologies

Thirteen years, eight months, and twenty-eight days: Clement; *Lib. gen.* 382. This is the same as the miscopied duration for Claudius reported by Eusebius, Clement, and *Chron. syn.*, and the original figure in the *Lib. gen.* (see above) and is therefore the result of a double dittography (from Nero to Claudius and then back to Nero).

Thirteen years and eight months lacking two days: Dio 63.29.3 = Zonaras 11.13, p. 482.2; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 181 ('thirteen years, seven months, and twenty-eight days'). This is correct.

Thirteen years, seven months, twenty-seven days: Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 351. An error for twenty-eight days.

Thirteen years, six months, twenty-eight days: Theophilus.

Thirteen years, six months, twenty-seven days: *Chron. syn.* 100.32. Here and in Theophilus, the 'six' is an error for 'seven'. Since *Chron. syn.* has twenty-eight for Claudius as a dittography from Nero, this twenty-seven must originally have been a twenty-eight at some point in the tradition.

Other Chronologies

Thirteen years and ten months: John of Antioch 120, p. 210.23 ('fourteen years lacking two months'); Nicephorus 92.21.

Thirteen years and eight months: Symeon the Logothete 54.2; *Syn. chron. B* 16.14–15; *Syn. chron. A* 28.23. This probably derives ultimately from Dio.

Thirteen years and seven months: *Lib. chron.* 433.1.

Thirteen years and two months: Malalas 10.30.

Thirteen years and eight days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 4.491, ms C of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 85, line 2). This is an error for 'eight months'.

Eleven years, nine months, and thirteen days: Tertullian, *Adu. Iud.* 8.16. This is surprisingly hopeless. The thirteen days appears to be a dittography from Caligula.

Commentary

The months figure tends to become corrupted more easily than usual with this duration, and for the most part we see numbers from six to nine for either seven (with days) or eight (rounded).

As was the case with Claudius, texts that normally follow Eusebius tend to report only thirteen years.

The *Breviarium* is too long by ten months and one day, but this must be an inclusive figure that has suffered some unusual corruption, with 'XIII' and 'V' for 'XIII' and 'VII'. Only the days figure has escaped unscathed.

41. Galba: eight months and twelve days ††

Accepted Chronology: 9 June 68 (Nero's death) to 15 Jan. 69 (Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.27.1; Plutarch, *Galba* 24.1, both from the same source), which yields a term of seven months and six/seven days.

Relevant Chronologies

Nine months and thirteen days: Dio 64.6.5² (p. 106), Zonaras 11.14, p. 484.11–12; Malalas 10.41 (Slavic translation),⁶ Symeon the Logothete 55.2, Cedrenus 379.10.

Other Chronologies

Two years, seven months, and six days: Theophilus. The 'two years' is intrusive, since the figure is otherwise identical to the correct figure as given by Clement and Tertullian (below).

[] years and three months: *Chron. epit.* 23.12.

Seven months and twenty-seven days: *Lib. chron.* 433.2.

Seven months and twenty-six days: Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 352.

Five months and twenty-six days: *Lib. gen.* 383. These last three figures are all related corruptions of the correct totals, with 'XXVI' for 'VI' (or if a Greek corruption, it would be 'Κς' for 'ς').

Seven months and seven days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 4.499; Aur. Victor 6.3, *Epit. de caes.* 6.1 (from Victor).

Seven months and six days: Clement; Tertullian, *Adu. Iud.* 8.16.

Seven months: Suet. *Galba* 23;(?) Eutropius 7.16.3; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 186^c, *Chron. pasch.* 459.19, Syncellus 416.10, George the Monk 382.11, *Chron. syn.* 100.41, *Anon. matr.* 48.8 (this number is assigned to Otho; Galba does not appear in the list, but the two have clearly been confused), ms C of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 86, line 2), *Syn. chron.* A 29.9;(?) Malalas 10.41 (Greek).

One month: Nicephorus 92.20.

Commentary

Dio's figure must be counting from Galba's *dies imperii* rather than the death of Nero. Dio's other calculations lead us to believe that his figure is almost certainly accurate and would therefore be counted normally from 2 April 68 (an otherwise unattested date), since we know that Galba died on 15 Jan. 69. This would therefore be his official *dies imperii*. See Appendix 1 § 3.3.

Josephus, Aurelius Victor (and hence the *Epit. de caes.*), Theophilus, Clement, and Tertullian are all witnesses to the correct figure. We would expect Victor to have taken his duration from the *KG*, which derived its figures from Suetonius, but Suetonius does not report the seven days (nor does Eutropius). As a result, either the *KG* had the detailed figures from a source other than Suetonius, and Eutropius

6 See the note in Jeffreys et al. 1986: 137. The duration figure listed in the Slavic translation is an interpolation, in spite of its partial inclusion in the Greek text by Thurn (p. 195), who keeps the seven months of the Greek manuscript, citing *Chron. pasch.* in support, and adds to it the thirteen days from the Slavic translation (which has nine months) to create his own composite figure.

failed to report the days, or Victor's source for this duration was not the *KG*. See Appendix 2 for other similar problems among the witnesses to the *KG*.

There also was a variant tradition that assigned Galba seven months and twenty-six days, instead of six days (*Lib. gen.* [with five months], Epiphanius, and *Lib. chron.*). There seems no obvious connection among these three works.

The *Breviarium*'s figure would therefore appear to be Galba's full reign (= Dio's tradition) with 'VIII' for 'VII' and 'XII' for 'XIII', both simple copying errors.

42. Otho: ninety days *†

Accepted Chronology: 15 January (death of Galba) to 16 April 69 (extrapolation), which yields a term of ninety-one/two days, which is three months and one day/two days. See Holzapfel 1913: 289–95 and Murison 1999: 70–1.

Relevant Chronologies

Ninety days: Dio 64.15.2¹, Zonaras 11.15, p. 486.12.

Three months: Plutarch, *Otho* 11.2, 18.2; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 186^e, Syncellus 416.11, Nicephorus 93.1, George the Monk 382.13, *Chron. epit.* 23.13, *Syn. chron.* A 29.13; *Epit. de caes.* 7.1; Malalas 10.42. This is ninety days.

Five months and one day: Clement. This is a corruption of three months and one day ('E' for 'Γ'), as can be determined from Clement's total duration of seventeen months for Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (1.21.146.6, p. 91), two months lower than the total of the individual months (7 + 5 + 7 = 19). The days figure is correct.

Three months and two days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 4.548. This is ninety-two days or ninety-one counted inclusively, as we would expect from Josephus.

Three months and eight days: Symeon the Logothete 56.2, Cedrenus 379.16. This is an error for 'two days' ('H' for 'B' in Greek). We would normally expect these two to follow Dio, but they do not in this case.

Other Chronologies

Eight months and twelve days: *Lib. gen.* 384. This looks like a dittography from Vitellius (see below).

Six months: *Chron. pasch.* 460.2.

Ninety-five days: Suet., *Otho* 11.2, *KG* (= Eutropius 7.17.3), John of Antioch 123, p. 214.11. This is counted inclusively between Otho's *dies imperii* on 15 January and Vitellius' on 19 April. The latter is probably from Eutropius.

Almost eighty-five days: Aurelius Victor 7.2. This is a mistake for ninety-five (his source was the *KG*).⁷

Three months and five days: Theophilus; Tertullian *Adu. Iud.* 8.16; Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 352. This is ninety-five days.

Two months: *Chron. syn.* 100.42. An error for three months?

Commentary

There are three traditions here: ninety days (= three months); ninety-one/two days, which counts the length of Otho's reign; and ninety-five days, which counts

7 It is impossible to know why Victor says 'fere' here. He does the same in 1.1 and 22.4 ('ferme').

the time between the accessions of Otho and Vitellius. It looks as though the rounded ‘three months’ we see in Plutarch, Eusebius, and the *Epit. de caes.* has been turned into a more accurate-looking ‘ninety days’ in Dio’s source (see Appendix 1 §9.3). The *Breviarium* agrees with this rounded figure, and it is important to note that the *Breviarium* agrees with Dio’s duration for Galba as well. Either the *Breviarium*’s durations for Galba and Otho derive from Dio (no doubt indirectly) or they both share a common source.

43. Vitellius: eight months and eleven days †

Accepted Chronology: 19 April (official *dies imperii*, as noted in the *Acta fratrum Arvalium* under 1 May; *CIL* 6.2051) to 20 December 69 (Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.67–85 [18 December plus two days] and Josephus, *Jewish War* 4.654 [3 Apellaeus]), which yields a term of eight months and one day/two days. See Holzapfel 1913: 295–304 and 1918: 99–105, and Murison 1999: 120.

Relevant Chronologies

Eight months and one day: Eutropius 7.18.6. This may have been obtained from a source other than the *KG* (below).

Seven months and one day: Clement. The seven is an error for eight, no doubt in an originally Latin text (‘VII’ for ‘VIII’).

Eight months and five days: Josephus, *Jewish War* 4.652, ms C of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 87, line 2). This is counted inclusively (as is the case with Josephus) from Otho’s death on 16 April.

Other Chronologies

One year: Symeon the Logothete 57.2. This is a rounded version of Dio’s figure.

A year lacking ten days (= eleven months and twenty days): Dio 65.22.1, Zonaras 11.16, p. 492.11–12. This is an incorrect calculation from Vitellius’ initial proclamation on 2 January 69 (Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.56.2) to the erroneous 22 December (*XI kal. Ian.* instead of *XIII kal. Ian.*; see Appendix 1 §9.4).

Ten months: *Chron. pasch.* 460.1.

Nine months and fifteen days: *Lib. gen.* 385.

Nine years, eight and a half months: Malalas 10.43. The nine years is intrusive and does not belong. The rest corresponds to the *Lib. gen.*/Epiphanius with the correct eight months.

Eight months and twenty-eight days: Tertullian, *Adu. Iud.* 8.16.⁸

Eight months and twelve days: Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 352–3. This is probably a Greek corruption of fifteen (‘IB’ for ‘IE’).

Eight months: Suet., *Vit.* 15.1, *KG* (= Aur. Victor 8.6, *Epit. de caes.* 8.1 via Victor); Syncellus 416.12, Nicephorus 93.2, *Anon. matr.* 48.9, *Syn. chron.* A 29.16.

Six months and twenty-two days: Theophilus. The manner of the obvious corruption here is not clear.

8 Only Φ/Q reports twenty-seven (accepted by Kroyman), which is almost certainly a result of scribal error (the loss of the final I), either medieval or sixteenth-century (see n. 5 above)

Three months: *Chron. syn.* 100.43.

Two months: George the Monk 382.16. Perhaps an error of 'B' for 'H' (two for eight).

Commentary

In the *HE*, Eusebius gives Galba and Otho together one year and six months (= eighteen months; 3.5.1), which is much more than the ten months he gives them in the *Chron. can.* (seven and three, above). This combined figure includes the eight months that Syncellus, Nicephorus, *Anon. matr.*, and *Syn. chron. A* give to Vitellius, who is neither mentioned in the *HE* nor given a duration in the *Chron. can.*⁹

It is hard to explain the variation in the main body of sources, which give the number of days as fifteen, twenty-two, and twenty-eight.

Suetonius' figure of eight months ('octauo imperii mense') is explicitly counted from Vitellius' accession on 2 January to July, when the Moesian, Pannonian, Syrian, and Judean armies revolted in support of Vespasian, who had been proclaimed emperor on 1 July (see below). July, however, was only the seventh month from Vitellius' accession, and Suetonius begins the detailed description of his downfall from that point, giving no sense at all that he survived for another four or five months. It may therefore be that Suetonius has confused the chronology, and that this eight months is in fact the official eight months from Vitellius' senatorial *dies imperii* on 19 April. On the other hand, the Moesian and Pannonian armies may not have revolted until more than a month after Vespasian's usurpation. It is unlikely that the Byzantine texts are related to Suetonius' account.

The *Breviarium* is too long by exactly ten days, which suggests that an 'X' was mistakenly added to the days figure.

44. Vespasian: twelve years, eight months, and twenty-eight days

Accepted Chronology: 1 July 69 (Suet., *Vesp.* 6.3; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.79.1) to 23 June 79 (Suet., *Vesp.* 24),¹⁰ which yields a term of nine years, eleven months, and twenty-two/three days. See Holzapfel 1921: 74–82 and Murison 1999: 178. If we count from the death of Vitellius on 20 December, we arrive at nine years, six months, and three/four days.

9 The Armenian translation of the *Chron. can.* gives him a reign of six months (Karst, p. 216), but there is no other evidence that the *Chron. can.* ever included a figure for Vitellius.

10 It has been said that there is a problem with the number in this date in Suet., *Vesp.* 24 (Holzapfel 1921: 76, with reference to the early editions, followed by, e.g., Murison 1999: 178); but there is no problem with the manuscripts, and the date works with Vespasian's birthday (*Vesp.* 2.1) and the length of Vespasian's life (*Vesp.* 24), if calculated inclusively. I suspect that the altered date of Vespasian's death in the early editions was a correction made by one or more of the editors (and then followed blindly by others) based on a normal count from Vespasian's birthday (i.e. via extrapolation) and not on any manuscript evidence, since all manuscripts derive from a single now-lost pre-Carolingian exemplar and there is no possibility of an alternative unknown and now-lost manuscript tradition (Reynolds 1983: 399–400). As can be seen, an understanding of how these regnal durations are calculated negates any need for theories like Holzapfel's that require multiple dates for Vespasian's death.

Relevant Chronologies

Nine years, eleven months, and twenty-two days: Theophilus; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 186, *Chron. pasch.* 460.4–5, *Chron. syn.* 100.44, *Anon. matr.* 48.10, *Syn. chron. B* 16.18.

Eleven years, eleven months, and twenty-two days: Clement. The first eleven is just a dittography of the second, since Clement gives Vespasian a round ten years at 1.21.144.2 (which implies a ‘nine’ here). He is the only source to give Vespasian seven years and seven months (1.21.146.5), which seems hopelessly corrupt.

Other Chronologies

Ten years and eight days: Symeon the Logothete 58.1, Cedrenus 380.4–5. The ‘ten’ looks as though it has come from a source that rounded up, and the word ‘days’ is probably an error for ‘months’ (cf. *Syn. chron. A*).

Ten years lacking six days (= nine years, eleven months, and twenty-four days): Dio 66.17.3, Zonaras 11.17, p. 495.13–14. This is calculated inclusively to the day of Titus’ accession (24 June), not Vespasian’s death.

Nine years and ten months: Malalas 10.44.

Nine years and eight months: *Syn. chron. A* 29.20.

Nine years, seven months, and twelve days: Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 353. This could be a corruption of the duration calculated from 20 December, as may be the case with Eutropius and *Lib. chron.* (see below).

Nine years and seven days: Eutropius 7.20.2. The word ‘days’ is probably an error for ‘months’ (see above on Epiphanius).

Nine years and five months: *Lib. chron.* 433.3.

Commentary

It is interesting that so few sources seem to be counting from the date of Vitellius’ death (20 December), as we would expect. One suspects that this must have been a result of the fact that Vespasian made much of his *dies imperii* during his reign. Vespasian is missing from the *Lib. gen.*

The *Breviarium* is hopelessly corrupt.

45. Titus: eight years and twelve days #

Accepted Chronology: 24 June 79 (extrapolated from regnal durations above and below) to 13 September 81 (Suet., *Titus* 11), which yields a term of two years, two months, and twenty/twenty-one days. See Holzapfel 1921: 75–6, 81 and Muri-son 1999: 180.

Relevant Chronologies

Two years, two months, and twenty days: Suet., *Titus* 11, *Epit. de caes.* 10.1; Dio 66.18.4, Zonaras 11.18, p. 495.18–19. For the strange split between Suetonius and the *Epit. de caes.* on the one hand and Victor and Eutropius on the other, see Appendix 2.

Two years, eighth months, and twenty days: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 10.5 [‘two years and almost nine months’], Eutropius 7.22.1), John of Antioch 132, p. 226.15 (days omitted; copied from Eutropius).

Three years, two months, and two days: *Lib. gen.* 386.

Two years, two months, and two days: Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 353–4; *Chron. syn.* 100.45.

Two years and twenty-two days: Theophilus.

Other Chronologies

Two years and nine months: *Lib. chron.* 433.4; *Syn. chron.* A 30.3.

Two years and three months: Symeon the Logothete 59.2. This is rounded up and correct.

Two years and two months: Clement; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 189 and *HE* 3.13, Nicephorus 93.7, *Syn. chron. B* 16.22.

Commentary

We have three major traditions: one with twenty days (correct), one with two, and one with twenty-two. There are a number of ways to explain the two incorrect figures. The twenty-two of Theophilus could be a dittography from Vespasian's regnal length, or an inclusive count between the dates of Vespasian's death and Titus'. The loss of the two months would then be the result of homoeoteleuton. It could also be the result of the loss of the word 'months', which left either 'II XX' in Latin or 'B K' in Greek, which was then 'corrected' to 'XXII'/'KB'. The 'two' of *Lib. gen./Epiphanius/Chron. syn.* would then be the result of an error that saw 'II' written for 'XXII' or 'B' for 'KB'.

The *Breviarium's* figure is a corrupt dittography from Galba (41). The statement of Titus' largesse ('congiarium promisit sed non dedit') was also copied from the same entry.

46. Domitian: seventeen years, five months, and five days ††

Accepted Chronology: 13 September 81 (death of Titus) to 18 September 96 (Suet., *Dom.* 17.3; *Fasti Ostienses* 45), which yields a term of fifteen years and five/six days. See Murison 1999: 201–2, 270, but note that the data below indicate that Domitian was proclaimed emperor on 13 September, not 14 September. If he was proclaimed on 14 September, no source was cognizant of it.

Relevant Chronologies

Fifteen years and five days: Dio 67.18.2, Zonaras 11.19, p. 503.14–15.

Fifteen years and five months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 189, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 356 and *Ancoratus* 6–7 (emended in Holl's edition from manuscript's five years and five months), Nicephorus 93.9, *Chron. syn.* 101.1, *Anon. matr.* 49.6; *Syn. chron. B* 17.1. Obviously a mistake of the word 'months' for 'days'.

Fifteen years, five months, and six days: Theophilus.

Fifteen years, eight months, and five days: Clement. The eight should be five ('H' for 'E').

Other Chronologies

Fifteen years and eleven months: Symeon the Logothete 60.2, Cedrenus, 429.13–14.

Fifteen years and nine months: *Lib. chron.* 433.5 (Pertinax is listed as his co-emperor). All three of the above would appear to be corruptions of 'five' months.

Fifteen years and two months: Malalas 10.48, *Syn. chron.* A 30.9. This would seem to be an error of ‘B’ for ‘E’.

Commentary

Domitian is missing from the *Lib. gen.*

The *Breviarium* is too long by about two years and five months and seems hopelessly corrupt apart from the correct five days. As can be seen, however, most sources give Domitian five months instead of five days (a figure frequently corrupted), and all therefore arise from the same mistaken source whose compiler expected a duration expressed in years and months, not years and days, and (no doubt unconsciously) wrote it that way. This tradition was then combined with the correct tradition in an early source, as we can see from Theophilus and Clement, who include the figures for both the months and the days. We can therefore see that the *Breviarium*’s duration is in fact related to the same source employed by Theophilus and Clement, one that combined the erroneous five months with the correct five days. This is not a unique instance of this phenomenon, as we shall see. The *Breviarium*’s month and day figures are actually more accurate than those in Clement and Theophilus. Its sole error is the odd change in the years from ‘XV’ to ‘XVII’.

47. Nerva: five years, four months, and one day

Accepted Chronology: 18 Sept. 96 (*Fasti Ostienses* 45, *Fer. Dur.* 201 [a supplement from *Fasti Ost.*]) to 28 Jan. 98 (extrapolated from Theophilus, Clement, and Dio, and the extrapolated date of Trajan’s accession), which yields one year, four months, and ten/eleven days. *Chron. pasch.* explicitly gives *VIII kal. Feb.*, 25 January, for the death of Nerva (469.14–15), which yields one year, four months, and seven/eight days. See Holzapfel 1921: 84–6.

Relevant Chronologies

One year, four months, and ten days: Theophilus; Clement; *Epit. de caes.* 12.1 (‘sixteen months and ten days’).

One year, four months, and nine days: Dio 68.4.2, Cedrenus 433.19. This is based on a Roman date calculation, so even though it differs from the ten days of Theophilus, Clement, and the *Epit. de caes.*, above, it is calculated to the same date. The date of 27 January for Nerva’s death that one often sees (e.g. Kienast, 120) is calculated from Dio’s date without compensating for his error.

One year, four months, and eight days: Eutropius 8.1.2. This is calculated inclusively to 25 January.

Other Chronologies

One year and four months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 192 (‘a little more than a year’, *HE* 3.21), Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 356 and *Ancoratus* 7, Nicephorus 93.15, *Chron. syn.* 101.2, *Syn. chron. B* 17.4, *Chron. epit.* 23.30; Aur. Victor 12.2 (sixteen months); *Lib. chron.* 433.6; Symeon the Logothete 61.2, Zonaras 11.20, p. 507.13 (Symeon and Zonaras report Dio’s figure without the days).

One year and one month: Malalas 10.53.

Commentary

Nerva is missing from the *Lib. gen.*

The chronologies of Theophilus, Clement, and Dio date the end of Nerva's reign and the beginning of Trajan's (see below) to the same day. Since Nerva was in Rome and Trajan was in Cologne, Nerva's death and Trajan's accession obviously cannot have happened on the same day, and there was some considerable delay even before news could be brought to Trajan, let alone before he could be proclaimed emperor by his army and the senate (see Bennett 1997: 53–4). Eutropius' eight days agrees with the *Chron. pasch.*'s date of 25 January for the death of Nerva, but it is not easy to see how *V kal. Feb.* (28 Jan.) became *VIII kal. Feb.* (25 Jan.) in Greek or Latin. Nevertheless, the appearance of the former tradition for both Nerva and Trajan in Theophilus, Clement, the *Epit. de caes.* (Nerva), Eutropius (Trajan), and especially Dio strongly indicate that it is correct, and since the *Chron. pasch.* explicitly connects this date to Nerva's death, it makes sense to date Nerva's death (rather than Trajan's accession) to 28 January and to treat the Eutropius/*Chron. pasch.* date as a variant of that tradition. Trajan's *dies imperii* must therefore have occurred many weeks later.

The *Breviarium* is wrong by four years, but the number of months at least is correct.

48. Trajan: nineteen years, four months, and twenty-seven days #; died on 9 July.

Accepted Chronology: 28 January 98 (extrapolation; this date in *Fer. Dur.* 198 is a supplement) to 9 August 117 (extrapolation), which yields nineteen years, six months, and twelve/thirteen days. See Holzapfel 1921: 86–90. It is surprising that we have no explicit source for either of these dates.

Relevant Chronologies

Nineteen years, six months, and fifteen days: Dio 68.33.3, Cedrenus 436.17–18; Eutropius 8.5.2. This is calculated inclusively to the accession of Hadrian (11 August) from 28 January. Eutropius' figures would seem to be the duration from the *KG*, which both Victor and the *Epit. de caes.* rounded to twenty years (13.11 and 13.1; see Appendix 2).

Nineteen years, seven months, and fifteen days: Clement.

Nineteen years, six months, and sixteen days: Theophilus. Clement and Theophilus' figures are both slightly corrupted versions of the Dio/Eutropius figure.

Other Chronologies

Nineteen years and six months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 193 and *HE* 4.3.1, Nicephorus 93.16, *Chron. syn.* 101.3, *Anon. matr.* 50.1, *Syn. chron. B* 17.5, *Syn. chron. A* 30.23; Malalas 11.1; Symeon the Logothete 62.2, Zonaras 11.22, p. 513.19. Symeon and Zonaras give Dio's duration without the days.

Seventeen years, eight months, and six days: *Lib. gen.* 387. This looks like a corrupted version of the duration given by Theophilus.

Commentary

The duration reported by Theophilus, Clement, Dio, and Eutropius simply counts to the accession of Hadrian, and so is of no value in determining the actual

date of the death of Trajan, which will vary according to whether one accepts the reality of the claim that Trajan died before adopting Hadrian as his heir (see Dio 69.1.3–4, *HA Hadrian* 4.8–10, and Eutropius 8.6.1). But any dates or length of life or reign figures that were in circulation in the second century would almost without doubt derive from the official reports of Trajan's death, and so we should not expect the 'real' date of his death to appear in or be able to be divined from these sorts of sources. The *HA* states that Hadrian learned of his adoption on 9 August ('V id. Aug.') and learned of Trajan's death on 11 Aug ('III id. Aug.'; *HA Hadrian* 4.6–7). At the time, Trajan was in Selinous in Cilicia and Hadrian was in Antioch (Dio 68.33.3 and 69.2.1), at least two days' travel apart (see Holzapfel 1921: 86–7). Trajan's reign is therefore calculated to extend between the death of Nerva (before Trajan's accession) and the *dies imperii* of Hadrian (after Trajan's death).

One Greek manuscript, Parisinus graecus 1712, the earliest manuscript of the text known as Ps-Symeon (see Wahlgren 2006: 46*, 87–9*), reports the duration of Trajan's life as sixty-eight years, ten months, and twenty-two days (Praechter 1896: 517). Since we know that Trajan was born on 18 September (Snyder 1940b: 238), this indicates that he died on 9 August, the date on which the *HA* states that Hadrian learned he had been adopted.¹¹ The source of these figures is unknown. It cannot be Dio, since his duration for Trajan's reign extends to 11 August, and one would expect both chronologies to count to the same day (as is the case elsewhere: see Snyder 1940a and Appendix 1 below). Unfortunately no duration for Trajan's life survives from Dio.

It may not be a coincidence that the *Breviarium*'s unique explicit date, though clearly wrong in its month, also indicates the ninth: 'VII idus Iulias' is 9 July. Correcting the name of the month in Latin, however, pushes the figure back to 7 August (no doubt the source of this date in Kienast, 123); 9 August is *V id. Aug.* There is no obvious way to explain the corruption of 9 August into what we find in the *Breviarium*, unless we invoke some kind of erroneous conversion from a Greek date, though what sort of source would supply a date like this in Greek is unknown.¹² It is worth remarking that this is the sole instance of a date for the death of an emperor in this text, and it is for a death whose date is known to have been controversial at the time. As a result, it may indeed derive from an independent tradition, but one that, like the *HA*, is rather less reliable than the other surviving traditions (it could, for instance, have claimed that Trajan had died a month earlier than the official account). An answer to this problem is unlikely to be found without new evidence. But even if both of these sets of figures do point to 9 August, they and the reign durations for Trajan are really just two different views of the same 'official' account.

11 Eutropius' sixty three years, nine months, and four days is completely wrong (8.5.2).

12 Dio, for instance, was writing in Rome and used Roman months. Other historians like Josephus and Eusebius used local Greek calendars but they were not writing in Rome. See Samuel 1972: 171–88 and Stern 2012: 259–94 for the differing ways in which the Julian calendar was adopted in the East, and for the use of hemerologia for converting these Eastern (Greek) dates to their Roman equivalents.

As is so often the case, then, we have two different calculations. The first ends with Hadrian's *dies imperii*, 11 August. This is what we see in Theophilus, Clement, Dio, and Eutropius. The other tradition is calculated to what we may understand to have been the 'official' date of Trajan's death on 9 August. This is made explicit by the length of Trajan's life found in Ps-Symeon (and the stated date of the *Breviarium*?).

The years of the *Breviarium* are correct, but it is difficult to explain the corruption of the other figures.

49. Hadrian: twenty years, ten months, and fourteen days †

Accepted Chronology: 11 Aug. 117 (*HA Hadrian* 4.7) to 10 July 138 (*HA Hadrian* 25.6), which yields twenty years, ten months, and twenty-nine/thirty days.

Relevant Chronologies

Twenty years, ten months, and twenty-eight days: Theophilus; Clement; *Lib. gen.* 388. This figure looks as though it is a day short, but it is apparently the result of a rare incorrect calculation with Roman dates, and so is correct.¹³ A common source must therefore be involved.

Twenty-one years, ten months, and twenty-nine days: Eutropius 8.7.3. This is correct apart from the added 'one' after 'twenty' for the years, which must have been an error in the *KG*, as we can see from Aur. Victor 14.12 ('twenty-second year lacking a month') and the *Epit. de caes.* ('twenty-two years', 14.1). This error must have derived ultimately from Marius Maximus, since we see the same error in *HA Hadr.* 25.11 (below) and there is no other evidence for the use of the *KG* this early in the biographies of the *HA*, where the author had two good narrative sources. It would be interesting to know if there is any connection between the twenty-two years here and in *Syn. chron. A* and Malalas (below).

Twenty-one years and eleven months: *HA Hadr.* 25.11. This is no doubt rounded from the original (see above).

Other Chronologies

Twenty-two years and ten months: *Syn. chron. A* 31.3. This may be a corruption of the figure in Dio (I for IA).

Twenty-two years and five months: Malalas 11.13.

Twenty years and eleven months: Dio 69.23.1, Symeon the Logothete 63.2, Zonaras 11.24 p. 521.18 ('twenty-one years lacking a month'; cf. Aur. Victor, above). Dio's figure is calculated to 11 July (*V id. Iul.*) rather than 10 July (see Appendix 1 §9.6).

Commentary

It looks as though we have 'XIII' for 'XXVIII' for the days figure in the *Breviarium*, a simple scribal error.

13 *III id. Aug.*–*VI id. Jul.* = 31 – (6 – 3) = 31 – 3 = 28. For this calculation, see Method 2 in Appendix 1.

50. Antoninus Pius: twenty-two years, eight months, and twenty-eight days ††

Accepted Chronology: 10 July 138 (*Fer. Dur.* 200) to 7 March 161 (accession of Marcus Aurelius), which yields twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-five/six days.

Relevant Chronologies

Twenty-two years and seven months: *Lib. chron.* 433.9. This is a truncated version of the correct duration.

Twenty-two years and eight months: *Syn. chron. B* 17.9. This is a rounded version of the correct duration.

[years], eight months, and twenty-two days: *Lib. gen.* 389. The ‘twenty-two’ is probably an error for ‘twenty-five’ (‘XXII’ for ‘XXV’). The years figure has been lost. The eight may have been influenced by rounded durations.

Other Chronologies

Twenty-two years, seven months, and six days: Theophilus. This figure is almost correct; it apparently has merely lost a K from the days figure in a Greek source. This day figures and that of Clement (below) appear to be closely related.

Twenty-two years, three months, and seven days: Clement. For the same three months, see Eusebius, below. The change from seven (or eight?) to three is not normal in either Latin or Greek.

Twenty-two years and three months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 202, Nicephorus 94.2, *Chron. syn.* 101.5, *Anon. matr.* 50.13–14.

Commentary

Again we have multiple traditions, one with three months, one with seven (correct), and one with eight, as well as one with six/seven days as well as the correct twenty-five (hiding in a corruption, if I have interpreted it correctly). No detailed duration survives for Pius in the epitomes of Dio and overall there is very little evidence at all.

The *Breviarium* seems to be a corruption of the tradition of the *Lib. gen.*

51. Lucius Verus: seven years, eight months, and twelve days §

Accepted Chronology: 7 March 161 (*Fer. Dur.* 198) to late 168 or early 169 (Jan./Feb. according to Kienast, 144; before end of 168 according to Barnes 1967: 73), which yields seven years and nine to eleven months.

Most histories and lists do not mention either Verus or the duration of his reign.

Chronologies

Twelve years: Nicephorus 94.5.

Eleven years: *KG* (= Eutropius 8.10.4; *Epit. de caes.* 16.5; Jerome, *Chron. can.* 205^k), *HA Verus* 11.1 (from Marius Maximus = source of *KG*).

Ten years and nine months: Cedrenus 439.15.

Nine years: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 205^k, *Chron. pasch.* 484.2, Syncellus 430.22.

Eight years: Malalas 11.32; George the Monk 451.21.

Commentary

The figure in Cedrenus is unique. Its origin is unknown, but given the number of surrounding dates that were taken from Dio, it is possible that Dio is also the source here (Dio survives only in small fragments at this point), though we would expect him to be more accurate.

Malalas and George's figure is close to reality, but that may simply be an accident. These sources otherwise know almost nothing about Verus: they describe him as Marcus' son and successor, and George explicitly says that Commodus was his brother.

The duration given by the *Breviarium* would appear to be just a bit too short. It would put Verus' death on 19 November, yet our other evidence suggests it was mid-winter (see Barnes 1967: 73 and Birley 1987: 157–8). Yet we cannot be certain of even that date, and what we do know is that the *Breviarium* is certainly more accurate than any other source, being incorrect only by a month or two at most. It may originally have been perfectly accurate and indeed may still be; we cannot determine even that.

There is no evidence that the compiler of the *Breviarium* was aware of the fact that Verus ruled along with Marcus Aurelius. If he had been, one would assume that they would have been treated together as 'Marcus Antoninus et Diuus Verus' or 'Marcus Antoninus cum Diuo Vero', as we see in the third century.

52. Marcus Aurelius: eighteen years, eleven months, and fourteen days #

Accepted Chronology: 7 March 161 (*Fer. Dur.* 198) to 17 March 180 (Tertulian, *Apol.* 25.5 and Dio 71.33.4², p. 275), which yields nineteen years and ten/even days.

Relevant Chronologies

Nineteen years and eleven days: Clement; Dio 71.34.5, Zonaras 12.3, p. 531.15–16.

Nineteen years and eleven months: Nicephorus 94.3. The word 'months' is an error for 'days', as is so often the case when no months figure appears.

Nineteen years and ten days: Theophilus.

Other Chronologies

Nineteen years and nine months: *Syn. chron.* A 31.23. Again, the word 'months' is an error for 'days', though the number is corrupt.

Nineteen years, five months, and twelve days: *Lib. gen.* 390. This is close to being correct if we discard the months.

Nineteen years and one month: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 204.

Eighteen years and nine months: Malalas 11.28. A corruption of the above figure from *Syn. chron.* A.

Fifteen? (γϵ' [sic]) years and one month: *Syn. chron.* B 17.10. A corruption of the figure in Eusebius.

Commentary

Once again, the sources that follow Eusebius round the duration instead of giving the details.

The *Breviarium* is completely wrong for every figure, but underneath we can see that we have a combination of figures, as was the case with Domitian: the days became months, as we see in Nicephorus, and then at some later date the correct days figure was added to the combined years/months figure. In addition, we have the later corruption of ‘XVIII’ to ‘XVIII’ (which is perfectly normal) and ‘XI’ to ‘XIII’ (which is not).

53. Commodus: sixteen years, eight months, and twelve days #

Accepted Chronology: 17 March 180 (Marcus Aurelius’ death) to 31 Dec. 192 (*dies imperii* of Pertinax), which yields twelve years, nine months, and fourteen/fifteen days.

Relevant Chronologies

Twelve years, nine months, and fourteen days: Clement; Dio 72.22.6, Zonaras 12.5, p. 538.11–12.

Twelve years and nine months: Cedrenus 441.3. This is Dio’s figure without the days.

Twelve years, eight months, and twenty-four days: *Lib. gen.* 391. The twenty-four (‘XXIII’/‘KΔ’) is an error for fourteen (‘XIII’/‘ΙΔ’).

Twelve years and eight months: Eutropius 8.15.

Twenty-two years and eight months: Malalas 12.1. The twenty-two arises from a Latin error for twelve (‘XXII’ > ‘XII’).

Fourteen years and eight months: *Syn. chron.* A 32.18. Another corrupted version of twelve years and eight months.

Twelve years, seven months, and nineteen days: *Lib. chron.* 433.11. The nineteen may be a Latin error for fourteen (‘XVIII’ > ‘XIII’). Is the tradition with an even eight months a rounded version of this duration? That would make the seven an untypical mistake for nine (‘VII’ > ‘VIII’)

Other Chronologies

Twelve years and five months: Symeon the Logothete 66.2.

Commentary

Once again the count is from the death of the previous emperor rather than from the *dies imperii* (which was three years earlier).

Although the figure of eight months in the *Breviarium* is incorrect, it has a strong tradition of its own (*Lib. gen.*, Eutropius, Malalas, and *Syn. chron.* A), which suggests that the original would have looked like a corrected version of the *Lib. gen.* The sixteen (‘XVI’) is an odd mistake for twelve (‘XII’), and the twelve (‘XII’) is probably a simple corruption of fourteen (‘XIII’).

54. Pertinax: seventy-five days ††

Accepted Chronology: 31 Dec. 192 (*HA Pertinax* 4.8) to 28 March 193 (*HA Pertinax* 15.6), which yields eighty-seven/-eight days.

Relevant Chronologies

Eighty-seven days: Dio 73.10.3, Symeon the Logothete 67.2, Zonaras 12.6, p. 542.14, Cedrenus 441.15.

Two months and twenty-five days (= eighty-five days): *HA Pertinax* 15.6.

Eighty-five days: *Epit. de caes.* 18.1.

Two months and eighteen days (= seventy-eight days): Malalas 12.14. The eighteen is an error for twenty-eight ('XVIII' > 'XXVIII'), which is probably a corrupt version of Dio's number, but may also be an independent inclusive count.

Other Chronologies

Seven months: *Lib. gen.* 392.

Six months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 210 and *HE* 5.26 ('not a full six months'), Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 429, 494 and *Ancoratus* 11, Syncellus 434.3, Nicephorus 94.7, *Chron. syn.* 101.8, *Anon. matr.* 51.10, *Syn. chron. B* 17.12, *Chron. epit.* 24.10; John of Antioch 146.2, p. 262.22.

Three months: *Syn. chron. A* 32.24.

Eightieth day: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 18.2, Eutropius 8.16). See Appendix 2, below.

Two months: *Chron. pasch.* 492.17; George the Monk 452.8 (who also notes correctly that he was assassinated in March; 452.10).

Commentary

There seem to be two valid traditions here. One counts eighty-five days, the other eighty-seven (including Malalas). Dio is the source of the latter, while the agreement of the *HA* and the *Epit. de caes.* suggests that Marius Maximus is the source of the former. Dio's figure for the length of Pertinax's reign is calculated to the date of 28 March supplied by the *HA*, as is his figure for the length of his life (see Appendix 1 §§ 5.1 and 6.1). On the other hand, the *HA*'s figures for the length of Pertinax's life (i.e. sixty-[six] years, seven months, and twenty-six days [*Pert.* 15.6]), counted from 1 August (*HA Pert* 15.6), which the *Feriale Duranum* (200) and the fourth-century calendar of Filocalus (D 42, p. 253) confirm as Pertinax's birthday, is calculated to 26 March. Eighty-five days, counted from 31 December, also dates Pertinax's death to 26 March. These figures for the length of Pertinax's reign and life in the *HA* must therefore derive from a source different from the one that supplied it with the date of 28 March for his death. In addition, *Lib. gen.* 393 appears to be counting Didius Julianus' reign from 26 March (see next section).

In the light of all this evidence, 28 March would therefore appear to be the date of the accession of Didius Julianus, not the death of Pertinax. The existence of such a gap between the two reigns is indicated explicitly by Herodian (2.6.3 = John of Antioch 146.2, p. 262.18), although no such explicit acknowledgement of it remains in the epitome of Dio (73.11.1–2). We have seen this method of counting between accession dates above.

The *Breviarium* is a witness to the tradition of Marius Maximus (eighty-five days counted to 26 March), missing an 'X' from its figure, thus 'LXXXV'.

55. Didius Julianus: sixty-five days *

Accepted Chronology: 28 March (see Pertinax, above) to 1 June 193 (extrapolated), which yields sixty-five/six days.

Dio gives Didius Julianus a reign of sixty-six days, the *HA* sixty-five days. Counted from 28 March, these are inclusive and normal counts to 1 June (see Appendix 1 § 6.2). Dio's figure for Septimius Severus' reign also indicates 1 June (see below). Kienast dates Julianus' deposition to 1 June and his death to 2 June (p. 154).

Julianus does not appear in every list, probably because he was missed by Eusebius.

Relevant Chronologies

Two months and five days (= sixty-five days): *HA Julian* 9.3.

Sixty-six days: Dio 73.17.5, Symeon the Logothete 68.2, Cedrenus 442.1.

Sixty days: Zonaras 12.7, p. 545.24. Given that Dio is Zonaras' indirect source, the six must have been omitted by Zonaras or his source.

Two months (= sixty days): *Syn. chron. A* 32.27. Probably a rounded figure from Dio as well.

Two months and seven days (= sixty-seven days): *Lib. gen.* 393. This would seem to have been counted normally from 26 March (see Pertinax, above).

Other Chronologies

Seven months: *KG* (= Eutropius 8.17, *Epit. de caes.* 19.1); Malalas 12.15, *Chron. pasch.* 493.6. Malalas knew Eutropius' work, but his account of Julianus' reign owes nothing to Eutropius, and so it is unlikely that there is any connection between the two figures.

Four months: George the Monk 452.12.

Three months: *Chron. syn.* 101.9. We would not have expected Julianus to appear in this text. He is not in Eusebius.

Commentary

As with Pertinax, the difference between the evidence of the *HA* and the witnesses to the *KG* is of great interest, since the assumption has always been that they are here both relying on the same source (directly and indirectly), Marius Maximus. See Appendix 2.

The *Breviarium* follows the same traditions as the *HA* (Marius Maximus?) as was also the case with Pertinax, above.

56. Septimius Severus: seventeen years, eleven months, and twenty-eight days #

Accepted Chronology: 9 April 193 (*Fer. Dur.* 199)¹⁴ to 4 Feb. 211 (Dio 76.15.2), which yields seventeen years, nine months, and twenty-five/six days. The total is seventeen years, eight months, and three/four days if calculated from 1 June 193 (see no. 55 above).

14 *HA Severus* 5.1 gives 'id. Aug.' (13 August) for Severus' accession, perhaps an error for 'id. Apr.' (13 April), which is nevertheless still wrong (it should be 'V id. Apr.'). There are no valid dates in the *HA* after Didius Julianus (the closest is 6 April for 4 and 8 April in *Caracalla*), and no valid regnal durations after Severus Alexander. See below for both.

Chronologies:

Seventeen years, nine and a half months: Malalas 12.18.

Seventeen years, eight months, and three days: Dio 76.17.4, Zonaras 12.10, p. 555.21.

Seventeen years and eight months: Symeon the Logothete 69.2, Cedrenus 442.6, *Syn. chron.* A 32.30. This is a truncated version of Dio.

Seventeen years, seven months, and fourteen days: *Lib. chron.* 433.12. The fourteen ('XIII') could be an error for four ('III').

Sixteen years and three months: Eutropius 8.19.2.

Commentary

Only Malalas, whose duration is off by ten days, is close to the correct figure from Severus' *dies imperii*. All other sources count from the death of Julianus. The *Lib. gen.* gives just a rounded fourteen years (394), which is strange for the reign of a recent emperor,

The *Breviarium* apparently gives a corrupted version of the full duration of Severus' reign from 9 April. The twenty-five can be seen hiding in the twenty-eight (somehow), but there is no easy way to explain how 'VIII' became 'XI'.

57. Geta: ten months and twelve days §

Accepted Chronology: 4 Feb. 211 (accession of Caracalla) to 19/26 Dec. 211, which yields ten months and fifteen/sixteen or twenty-two/-three days. Both of these dates for Geta's death, however, depend on the *Breviarium* through the emendation of the days figure from 'XII' to 'XV' (Halfmann 1982: 229–30, esp. n. 49) or to 'XXII' (von Domaszewski 1918: 62–4, most recently popularized by Barnes 1971: 264–5). See also Meckler 1995: 258 n. 7 (referring to his unpublished dissertation), who suggests a date of 25 December, and the quick and inconclusive survey of Krüpe 2011: 195–8.

Geta is passed over by almost all lists.

Chronologies

One year: Malalas 12.23; *Syn. chron.* A 33.15.

Two months: George the Monk 460.1, Cedrenus 448.21. This is six years and two months (see below) minus the six years.

Commentary

Note that Geta's reign in the *Breviarium* has been calculated from the death of his father Severus, rather than from his proclamation as augustus in late 209/early 210.

Halfmann's emendation is much more likely than von Domaszewski's given the range of dates: we know from Dio (77.2.1) that Geta's death must have been after 17 December (start of Saturnalia), and from *HA Carac.* 4.2 that it must have been before the murder of Papinian's son, a quaestor, who died a 'triduum' after the end of the annual quaestorian games, which extended from 2 to 24 December (see December in the calendar of Filocalus [D 42, p. 261], with Deggrasi 1963: 540), i. e. on 26/27 December. Barnes says the death of Papinian's son was 'three or four days' after the twenty-fourth (1971: 265 n. 1); but that is not a possible interpreta-

tion of ‘triduum’, which can only be three days whether counting inclusively or normally, thus two or three days later.¹⁵ Furthermore, *HA Carac.* 2.4–4.2 indicates a considerable time between Geta’s death and that of Papinian’s son. Thus if Papinian’s son was killed on 26 or 27 December, Geta cannot have been slain on the twenty-sixth. Whether we can accept the emendation of ‘XII’ to ‘XV’ will hinge on what our general conclusions are regarding the accuracy of the *Breviarium*’s figures.

As was the case with Verus, there is no evidence that the compiler of the *Breviarium* was aware of the fact that Geta ruled along with Caracalla.

58. Caracalla: six years, two months, and fifteen days †

Accepted Chronology: 4 Feb. 211 (*Fer. Dur.* 198) to 8 April 217 (Dio 78.5.4), which yields six years, two months, and four/five days.

HA Caracalla 6.6 says 6 April (‘VIII id. Apr.’) was Caracalla’s birthday and the date of his death.¹⁶ Dio says his birthday was 4 April (= ‘prid. non. Apr.’), that he was killed on 8 April, and that he had lived twenty-nine years and four days, which matches 8 April (78.6.5 and 5.4). The *Feriale Duranum* confirms that his birthday was 4 April (199).

Relevant Chronologies

Six years, two months, and two days: Dio 78.6.5. Other internal evidence noted just above suggests that this may be a scribal corruption for ‘four days’ (δύο erroneously written from δ’) and it is usually so emended, but two days would account for the date 6 April in the *HA* ($4 + 2 = 6$), and ‘two days’ appears in the *Lib. gen.* (next) as well.

Six years, nine months, and two days: *Lib. gen.* 395. The ‘two days’ appears again, and since there is no connection among the *Lib. gen.*, Dio, and the *HA*, this apparently represents a variant tradition that is shared by all three texts. If this is so, this tradition would have to be separate from the tradition for Dio’s length of Caracalla’s life, since that is correct (it reports four days and thus indicates 8 April, not 6 April). The text of Dio should not, therefore, be emended from ‘two’ to ‘four’, but should remain as it appears in the manuscripts, even though it is incorrect. The shift in the months of the *Lib. gen.* from ‘II’/‘B’ to ‘VIII’/‘Θ’ is easier to explain in Greek.

Six years, two months, and some days: Zonaras 12.12, p. 564.4–5. This derives from Dio.

Six years and two months: Eutropius 8.20.2; George the Monk 460.2 and 5, Symeon the Logothete 70.2, Cedrenus 448.22. George and Cedrenus give just six years (the ‘twenty-six’ in George [460.5] is a scribal error for ‘six’), which is this

15 Just as Aurelius Victor says that Nepotian, who was emperor for twenty-eight days, died ‘tricesimo die triduo minus’ (42.8).

16 It also says it was the feast of the Megalensia, which started on 4 April, so it does look as though in the *HA*’s original source the birthday was dated to 4 April, not 6 April, and that the author has conflated the dates of Caracalla’s birthday and death.

figure minus the two months of his rule with Geta (see above). The Greek sources are just abbreviating Dio's figure.

Other Chronologies

Seven years and six months: Eusebius, *HE* 6.21.1 (an even seven years in *Chron. can.* 213), *Chron. syn.* 101.11.

Six years and twenty-two days: Malalas 12.24.

Commentary

Note that, as with his brother Geta, Caracalla's reign is calculated from the death of his father Severus rather than from his *dies imperii* of 28 January 198.¹⁷

Note too that more and more sources are beginning to drop the detailed figures and report just full years (which I do not include here, hence the declining length of the citation of the evidence).

Since we know that Caracalla died on 8 April and that his age and reign were counted from the fourth (April and February), the two days reported by the main traditions (Dio, *HA*, and *Lib. gen.*) would seem to be a corruption of an inclusive five days ('II' for 'V', a Latin error). This is supported by the *Breviarium*'s day figure of 'XV', which is therefore an error for 'V'.

59. Macrinus: one year, four months, and two days

Accepted Chronology: 11 April 217 (Dio 78.11.6)¹⁸ to 8 June 218 (Dio 78.39.1, corrected from the manuscript's 8 July, a simple scribal confusion between IOYNIOY and IOYAIOY,¹⁹ a correction necessitated by Dio's reign duration). This yields one year, one month, and twenty-eight/-nine days.

Relevant Chronologies

One year and two months lacking three days (= one year, one month, and twenty-eight days):²⁰ Dio 78.41.4, Zonaras 12.13, p. 566.17–18.

17 Kienast states that the *dies imperii* of 28 January is false and the real date was 8/9 April (p. 162); 9 April is in fact Septimius Severus' *dies imperii*. The source for this would seem to be a reference to a forthcoming article by Fritz Mitthof in Alföldy 1996: 33–4 and n. 71 (with reference to an anniversary celebration in papyrus *BGU* II 362 XI 3–5). I have not been able to trace this article, and can find no other references to it or to the interpretation it supposedly advances. The citation of Mitthof in Kienast (p. 165, where '2 Pap' = ZPap = ZPE) refers to an unrelated paper. See esp. Heil 2003: 269 n. 15. Certainly the fact that 28 January 198 is exactly one hundred years after the *dies imperii* of Trajan is worth noting, but it could just as easily have been observed by Severus and acted upon at the time. After all, Severus was not unaware of these anniversaries (see Alföldy 1996: 34 n. 71), and Caracalla was at that point the youngest person ever proclaimed augustus, which could be explained by the arrival of that anniversary.

18 Dio says this was Severus' birthday, and the *Feriale Duranum* (199) and the calendars of Filocalus and Polemius Silvius (D 42, p. 245 and D 43, p. 267) confirm this. Dio also says it was four days after 8 April, which is counting inclusively, whereas he usually counts normally for his date calculations (see Appendix 1).

19 The same mistake appears in Zonaras 11.13, p. 481.19, where Nero is said to have died in July (instead of June).

20 This is the only correct reverse calculation in Dio (see Appendix 1 § 5.2).

One year and two months: *KG* (= Eutropius 8.21, Aur. Victor 22.4 [‘almost fourteen months’], *Epit. de caes.* 22 [‘fourteen months’], *HA Diad.* 8.2 [‘fourteenth month’]); Symeon the Logothete 71.2. Symeon’s figure is from Dio.

One year, two months, and six days: *Lib. gen.* 396.

Other Chronologies

One year and eight months: *Syn. chron.* A 33.22.

One year and seven months: (Malalas) 436.3 (called ‘Magrinus Gallus’).

Commentary

Dio’s final date is the date of Macrinus’ defeat in battle, but he survived as a fugitive for some considerable amount of time before finally being arrested and assassinated (see Dio 78.39.1–40.2). The date of the *KG* is counting to the same battle, so it must have been regarded at the time as the end of Macrinus’ rule.

The *Breviarium* is wrong by two months, and it is difficult to explain the process of corruption. Yet it may not be as corrupt as it appears, as we shall see in the next section.

60. Elagabalus: six years, eight months, and eighteen days ††

Accepted Chronology: 16 May 218 (Dio 78.31.4) to 14 March 222 (*dies imperii* of Severus Alexander), which yields three years, nine months, and twenty-six/seven days. But counted from the defeat of Macrinus (8 June 218), Elagabalus’ reign would be three years, nine months, and six/seven days.

Relevant Chronologies

Three years, nine months, and four days: Dio 79.3.3, Zonaras 12.14, p. 570.18, Cedrenus 449.18–19. This is calculated from the Roman dates and is correct (see Appendix 1 § 1.2).

Three years and nine months: Symeon the Logothete 72.2; *Syn. chron.* A 33.29. These are from Dio.

Three years, eight months, and twenty-eight days: *Lib. gen.* 397.

Other Chronologies

Four years and two months: (Malalas) 436.4.

Two years and eight months: *KG* (= Eutropius 8.22, *Epit. de caes.* 23.1).

Thirty months (= two years and six months): Aur. Victor 23.3. No doubt a mistake for (or rounding of) ‘thirty-two months’, since we would expect the figure to originally have been the same as that in the *KG* (= Eutropius and *Epit. de caes.*), although that is not always the case (see Appendix 2).

Commentary

There is no explicit evidence for the date of the death of Elagabalus, which must have taken place on or before 13 March when Severus Alexander was proclaimed augustus by the army (*Fer. Dur.* 198). Kienast suggests 11 or 12 March (p. 172).

If we add the total duration of the reigns of Macrinus and Elagabalus (counting from the defeat of Macrinus for the latter), we get four years, ten months, and thir-

ty-four days. If we add the two quite different and seemingly corrupt duration figures for the same two emperors from the *Liber generationis*, we get four years, ten months and thirty-four days. Exactly the same.

Actual (Macrinus): one year, one month, and twenty-eight days

Lib. gen. (Macrinus): one year, two months, and six days

Actual (Elagabalus): three years, nine months, and six days.

Lib. gen. (Elagabalus): three years, eight months, and twenty-eight days

The obvious parallel between the twenty-eight days for Macrinus (real) and for Elagabalus (*Lib. gen.*) and the six days for Macrinus (*Lib. gen.*) and for Elagabalus (real) demonstrates that the *Lib. gen.*'s day numbers are in origin a result of a transposition. Yet the length of Macrinus' reign is only eight days longer in the *Lib. gen.*, while that of Elagabalus is only eight days shorter (assuming a basic month of thirty days). This is apparently as a result of an alteration of the month figures to partially compensate for the transposition: one month increased to two for Macrinus (whose days were reduced), and nine months reduced to eight for Elagabalus (whose days were increased), just as if someone were trying to fit the transposed numbers into the same overall total I noted above. It may be suspected that we are looking at a different tradition here, one that dated Macrinus' deposition or death (and therefore Elagabalus' accession) to 17 June instead of 8 June, namely one year, two months, and six days after 11 April. However, if we then count three years, eight months, and twenty-eight days from 17 June (the *Lib. gen.*'s figure for the reign of Elagabalus), we arrive at 17 March, which has gone beyond 14 March, the date that we know to be *dies imperii* of Severus Alexander.²¹ And besides, it would be an amazing coincidence if this alternative date just happened to result in exactly the opposite number of days for each emperor (twenty-eight and six shifted to six and twenty-eight).

As a result, the change in these figures must be the result not of anything that happened in reality, but of some intentional tampering. The cross-parallels with the real figures make it clear that the *Lib. gen.*'s figures somehow originated in a transposition of day numbers between the two emperors. But that cannot explain the consequent emendation of the month figures, and I am at a loss to offer a plausible explanation.

Whatever the cause of the alterations, it now becomes obvious that the *Breviarium* is a witness to this same tradition. The original three years, eight months, and twenty-eight days (*Lib. gen.*) for Elagabalus has become six years, eight months, and eighteen days, with six a simple error for three ('VI' for 'III') and eighteen for twenty-eight ('XVIII' for 'XXVIII'). If that is the case, then the *Breviarium*'s duration for Macrinus – one year, four months, and two days – is a corruption not of the actual one year, one month, and twenty-eight days, but of the one year, two months,

21 The first (real) sequence and the *Lib. gen.* produce two different end dates, although both are counting the same number of days from the same starting point. This is because the first (real) sequence counts its six days within March (8 to 14 March), whereas the *Lib. gen.* is counting twenty-eight days from 17 February and February has three days fewer than March, the same number of days between 14 and 17 March.

and six days of the *Lib. gen.* This corruption is hardly easier to explain, but the figures are at least somewhat closer to their originals. Perhaps we are looking at a corrupted transposition: one year, two months, and six days became one year, six months, and two days and then the six was corrupted to four.

The one solid result of all this analysis is that the date of 14 March (for Elagabalus' death, but in reality the accession of Severus Alexander) obtained from the *Feriale Duranum* and Dio has been shown to lie behind the figures of the *Lib. gen.* and *Breviarium* as well.

61. Severus Alexander: thirteen years, eight months, and nine days *†

Accepted Chronology: 14 March 222 (*Fer. Dur.* 198) to mid-March 235 (Peachin, 26–7),²² which yields roughly thirteen years. See Rubensohn 1890.

Relevant Chronologies

Thirteen years and nine days: *Lib. gen.* 398; *KG* (= Eutropius 8.23,²³ *HA Sev. Alex.* 60.1 [see also *Elag.* 35.2]).

Thirteen years and eight months: Symeon the Logothete 73.2, Cedrenus, 450.4.

Other Chronologies

Eight years and four months: (Malalas) 436.5.

Commentary

The 'eight months' of Symeon and Cedrenus is almost certainly an error for 'eight days', and is thus the sort of combination error that we have seen above (e. g. Domitian). The number could be the result of a normal calculation, which would make the nine days of the *KG* and *Lib. gen.* inclusive. Yet the previous six correct figures in the *Lib. gen.* were calculated normally, so the nine here is probably a normal count as well. The eight must therefore be a corruption, 'VIII' for 'VIII' in a Latin source, as it is in some manuscripts of Eutropius (see n. 23, above).²⁴ The eight months is mirrored by the *Breviarium*, which shows that the corruptions of days to months and nine to eight must have arisen long before Symeon's history was written in the tenth century and even before Eutropius.²⁵ See Peachin 1985: 75–6.

22 Kienast gives Feb./March for Maximinus' accession (pp. 177 and 183), but this is because he does not accept Peachin's redating of *POxy* VI 912 from 25 February to 30 August (Peachin 1985). This redating has, however, been generally accepted, including by the Oxyrhynchus Papyri online database.

23 A significantly large and important group of manuscripts gives 'eight days', but the durations of the *HA* and the *Breviarium* shows that Santini is correct in accepting 'nine'.

24 The correct figures calculated normally in the *Lib. gen.* are Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Commodus, Didius Julianus, Macrinus, and Elagabalus. If my interpretation of the corruption for Galba is correct, his regnal duration was calculated normally as well. Nero's regnal duration, however, was counted inclusively, as Tiberius' may have been. Eutropius' figures vary almost equally between normal and inclusive, so his usage cannot help with this determination.

25 Since the erroneous 'eight months' appears in the *Breviarium*, the corruption of 'nine' to 'eight' cannot be the result of influence on the Byzantine tradition from the manuscript variant in Eutropius, since the *Breviarium* was written thirty or thirty-five years before Eutropius.

We therefore have enough independent evidence to state that Severus Alexander's reign lasted thirteen years and nine days. The problem is determining the starting point (13 or 14 March). The evidence of the *Lib. gen.*, for which this is the last entry, is exactly contemporary. It is confirmed by the date obtained by the author of the *KG* and, to a certain extent, by the corrupted version we see in the later Byzantine tradition of Symeon and Cedrenus: there can have been no common source among these texts, so the figure must represent the standard calculation of the time, which would have counted from 14 March, his official *dies imperii*.

Counting thirteen years and nine days normally from 14 March 222 takes us to 23 March 235, which is far too late in view of Alexander's location in Mainz and the evidence that Maximinus was co-opted into the *sodales Antoniniani* as augustus on 25 March in Rome (*CIL* 6.2001.12–16; Peachin, 26–7; Kienast, 183). However, as we have seen so often above, the duration of a reign generally extends from *dies imperii* to *dies imperii*, so 23 March is almost certainly the date of Maximinus' official *dies imperii* in the senate, not Alexander's death. This suits the *sodales*' date perfectly.²⁶

As can be seen, the *Breviarium* has accurately combined two quite different traditions, one of which had been corrupted before it reached the compiler's source before the 330s and long before our next earliest evidence for it in the tenth century.

From this point on, since we no longer have any dates for accessions or deaths until Diocletian, I include all the above-cited sources even if they note only full years (previously these were set aside).

Once again, it should also be noted that the *Breviarium* itself has played a large part in determining the modern calculations of the chronology of the third century, and so it should not cause surprise if we find individual agreement between some modern estimates and its figures.

62. Maximinus: three years, four months, and two days §

Accepted Chronology: 23 March 235 (see § 61) to mid-April 238 (Kienast, 183) or early June (Peachin, 26–7) 238, which yields three years and one to three months.

Chronologies

Six years: Symeon the Logothete 74.2, Zonaras 12.16, p. 578.10, Cedrenus 450.13. In spite of the fact that this evidence is Greek, this looks like an originally Latin error of 'VI' for 'III'.

Five years: *Lib. chron.* 433.15.

Three years and ten months: (Malalas) 436.6. Should this be three years and ten days?

Three years and a few days: Eutropius 9.1.

26 Since Alexander was born on 1 October (Calendar of Filocalus, D 42, p. 257), the length of his life in the *HA* (twenty-nine years, three months, and seven days [*Sev. Alex.* 60.1]), is completely wrong (= 8 January). Furthermore, the *HA* says he was born on the same day that Alexander the Great died (= 10 June; 5.2), which is incorrect and would indicate a date of 17 September for his death. Like all the dates in the second half of the *HA*, these dates are fabricated and useless.

Three years: Herodian 7.4.1; Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 216 and *HE* 6.28 ('not more than three years'), Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 505 and *Ancoratus* 13, *Chron. pasch.* 500.16, Syncellus 442.8, Nicephorus 94.19, George the Monk 460.21, *Chron. syn.* 101.15, *Anon. matr.* 52.10, *Syn. chron. B* 17.19, *Chron. epit.* 24.20, *Syn. chron. A* 35.19; *KG* (= Aur. Victor 26.1, 27.5, *Epit. de caes.* 25.1, *HA Max. et Balb.* 15.7 ['according to some']), John of Antioch 169.11, p. 322.1. Victor and the *Epit. de caes.* are probably abbreviated versions of what we find in Eutropius (above), via the *KG*. See Appendix 2. John of Antioch is no doubt drawing on Eutropius.

Two years: *HA Max. et Balb.* 15.7 ('according to others').

Commentary

Eutropius (and Malalas?) indicates that the actual duration was just a few days longer than three years, the duration noted by most other sources. The *Breviarium* is therefore four months too long. The reigns of the Gordians (twenty[-two] days, § 63) and Balbinus and Pupienus (ninety-nine days, § 64) add up to exactly one day more than four months. If we subtract that figure from Maximinus' total, it would roughly agree with Eutropius and Malalas (= three years and one day). This would suggest that the *Breviarium*'s duration originally included Gordian I and II as well as Balbinus and Pupienus, from a source that, like Eusebius, did not count these ephemeral emperors as legitimate (though Eusebius had the correct length of Maximinus' reign; he added the extra months to Gordian III: see below). The compiler of the *Breviarium* would therefore seem to have combined at least two sources: his major source that did not include these minor emperors and added their time as emperor to the reign of Maximinus and another that did include them and the length of their reigns, which the compiler dutifully added, without realizing that they had already been included in the previous reign. Eutropius, Malalas, and the *Breviarium* would therefore indicate the last few days of March or first few days of April 238 for the senatorial acceptance of the two Gordians.

63. Gordian I and II: twenty days †

Accepted Chronology: Jan. (Kienast, 188 and 190) or March/April (Peachin, 28) 238, which yields less than one month.

Chronologies

Most sources are unaware of the existence of these emperors, and the *Breviarium* is the only Latin source apart from the *HA* and the emperor list of the calendar of Polemius Silvius (see Burgess 1993: 494) that knows of three Gordians. All other Latin historians – Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and the *HA* – only know of two Gordians (I and III), and that would seem to be because of the fact that they were following the *KG*. The author of the *HA* is aware of only two Gordians while following the *KG* and only becomes aware of Gordian II when he begins using his Greek sources (cf. *Macrinus* 3.5, *Diadumenus* 6.3, and esp. *Helio-gabalus* 34.6, with *Maximini Duo* and *Gordiani Tres*, esp. 2.1, where he criticizes those who are only aware of two and cites Herodian and Dexippus as his sources for three).

Twenty years: (Malalas) 436.10 (assigned to Gordian II). An obvious error for twenty days.

Twenty-two days: (Malalas) 436.9 (Gordian I), Symeon the Logothete 75.2 (assigned to Maximus and Balbinus), Zonaras 12.17, p. 579.21–2, *Syn. chron. A* 36.15 (Gordian ὁ γέρον; his son of the same name, not Gordian III, ruled for six years: 36.16–17 with 35.25–7, 35.31–36.3, 9–10, 13–15).

Twenty-two days, ‘others say not quite three months’: Zonaras 12.17, p. 579.6–7 (assigned to Maximus and Albinus [*sic*]).

Commentary

Malalas correctly attributes a longer reign to Gordian I (twenty-two days) than to Gordian II (twenty days). It is the former that is picked up by the later Byzantine tradition. It may be the latter that appears in the *Breviarium*, though this may be a corruption of ‘XXII’.

The important question here is where the figure of twenty/twenty-two days comes from. The figure appears in Symeon’s tenth-century account of Maximus and Balbinus, but no mention is made of the two Gordians. Zonaras and *Syn. chron. A*, of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, are usually said to have relied on Malalas, of the mid-sixth century, though not directly: see Jeffreys et al. 1986: 159–60; Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 266–7; and Banchich 2009: 79–80 n. 14. Malalas’ source is unfortunately unknown, not least because this part of his work is missing, and the sources he is usually thought to have used for this section (Domninus, Nestorianus, and Timotheus) are themselves unknown (in general, see Jeffreys, Croke, Scott 1990: 167–216, esp. 178–9, 187, 195, and 197–9).

The misunderstood remnants of Latin designations for the Gordians – Σενίωq (‘senior’) for Gordian III (*sic*) in *Chron. pasch.* 501.6 and 502.3 and Ἰουνίωq (‘iunior’) for a non-existent emperor before Gordian III in Cedrenus (451.7–10) and George the Monk (461.8, Ἰούνωq) – strongly suggest that a Latin source underlies at least part of the confused narrative.²⁷ It may be relevant that Gordian I is called ‘Gordianus senior’ by Eutropius (9.2.1) and Γορδιανὸς ὁ γέρον by *Syn. chron. A* 36.14, and that Ammianus Marcellinus, too, only seems to know of two Gordians (I and III), whom he called ‘superior Gordianus’ and ‘iunior Gordianus’ (26.6.20 and 23.5.7, 17). This evidence suggests that this common Latin source knew of only two Gordians, a ‘senior’ and a ‘iunior’, just like the *KG*. (Indeed, it may actually have been the *KG*: see p. 30 above). Although Zonaras (580.1–6) and the very closely related *Syn. chron. A* (35.25–7, 36.14–17, 20, which correctly calls Gordian III Γορδιανὸς ὁ τρίτος), have echoes of a source that knew of two Gordians in Africa and one in Rome, they too both confuse the second and third (Zonaras 12.17–18, pp. 579.23–4, 580.7–14, and 581.17–582.13 and *Syn. chron. A* 36.16–19 and 20–31).

²⁷ Note also the strange stories in *Chron. pasch.* that two groups of ‘candidati’ (imperial bodyguards) were named ‘seniores’ after Gordianus Senior, Γορδιανὸς Σενίωq, and ‘iuniores’ after Philip I, Φίλιππος ὁ Ἰουνίωq (501.6, 13–17, 502.3, 5, 14–19, 503.2). George and Cedrenus say it was Iunior (= Gordian III?) who named the candidati ‘iuniores’ (461.8–11 and 451.7–10), which is more likely to be close to what the original source said.

For a detailed account of the events in Africa, see John of Antioch 169.1–6, pp. 312–16 = Herodian 7.4–7, 9 = Zonaras 12.16, pp. 576.21–577.13 and 12.17, p. 580.1–6 (with Banchich 2009: 81 nn. 18–19) and Zosimus 1.14–16. For detailed notes on the confused narrative in all these related sources, including the account of Balbinus and Pupienus, which is inextricably linked to it, see Jeffreys et al. 1986: 159–60 with Thurn's edition of Malalas, V–X, pp. 226–7, and Banchich 2009: 82–89.²⁸ There clearly were so many divergent accounts of the events of this year with so many different real and imagined emperors (see also below) that later historians like Zonaras simply had no means of sorting them all out.

The original figure in the *Breviarium* was therefore probably 'XXII', from which the '-II' has been lost. The compiler's knowledge of Gordian I and II and their reign of twenty-two days clearly indicates a source independent of the *KG* tradition. The nature of this source will be briefly analysed in Chapter 6.

64. Balbinus and Pupienus: ninety-nine days §

Accepted Chronology: Jan/Feb. to early May (Kienast, 191 and 193) 238, which yields three months, or late April to early August (Peachin, 28–9) 238, which yields three and a half months

Chronologies

Most Greek emperor lists do not include these emperors.

The utter confusion over these emperors in the sources requires a different format of presentation (as noted above; see Banchich 2009: 82–9).

HA: Maximus and Balbinus: one year (*Max. et Balb.* 15.7).

(Malalas): Balbinus: one year and three months; Pupilius: three and a half months (436.7–8).

Chron. pasch.: Balbinus: three months; Pupilius: one hundred days (501.4–5).

George the Monk (461.2, 5, and 8)/Cedrenus (450.21, 451.5 and 7): Balbinus/Maximus Balbinus and Gordian: two months; Pupilianus: two months; Iunor/Iunior: three months.

Chron. syn.: Pompeianus and Basilinus: six years (101.16; = Gordian III). As with Didius Julianus, it is odd that these ephemeral emperors are known to sources such as those above.

28 Banchich 2009: 88–9 n. 23 is wrong to connect the accounts of Eutropius and Jerome (not Eusebius: the passage is starred in Helm's edition) with Zonaras' account of the arrival and death of Gordian I in Rome after sailing from Africa (12.17, p. 579.18–22 = *Syn. chron.* A 36.13–16, with same vocabulary and age, and 35.25–7, 35.31–36.1, 9–10; cf. Zonaras 12.16, pp. 576.21–577.13, from Herodian via John of Antioch). The origin of the story may be related in some way to the account of the loss of Gordian I and II in a storm sailing to Rome epitomized in Zosimus 1.15.2–16.1 (see Paschoud's n. 40 on p. 143 of his edition of Zosimus). Eutropius and Jerome, on the other hand, reflect the *KG*, which is referring to Gordian III, not Gordian I: 'cum [Pupienus, Balbinus, Gordianus] Romam uenissent, Balbinus et Pupienus in palatio interfecti sunt' (Eutropius 9.2.2) and 'Gordiano Romam ingresso Pupienus et Balbinus ... in palatio occisi' (Jerome, *Chron. can.* 216i, dated to Gordian's second year).

Zonaras: Maximus and Albinus: twenty-two days, ‘some say’ not quite three months; Pompeianus: not quite two months; Puplius Balbinus: three months (12.17, p. 579.6–7, 10–11, 15).

Syn. chron. A: Balbinus/Galbius and Maximus/Maximinus: three months; Pompeianus: two months; Puplius Galbinus: three months (36.2–3, 10–13).

Commentary

The confusion noted above for Gordian I and II simply grows worse. The differing names assigned to M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus in the Latin and Greek traditions²⁹ (again, as with ‘senior’ and ‘junior’ above, proving the use of a Latin source in the tradition) and the later corruptions of both names in the Greek traditions (Pupienus = Pompeianus and Puplius/Pulpius/Puplianus, and Balbinus = Albinus and Basilinus), along with the misunderstood Latin adjectives for the Gordians (see § 63), resulted in a duplication and confusion of these emperors. Surprisingly enough, Symeon the Logothete alone somehow manages to get the names of Maximus and Balbinus correct (§§ 74–5, p. 99).

Chron. syn. combines this reign with that of Gordian III through haplography and assigns six years (Gordian III) to a pair of emperors he calls ‘Pompeianus and Basilinus’ (101.16).

The ninety-nine days of the *Breviarium* equates to the three months of the Greek tradition, which comes out as a round 100 days in *Chron. pasch.* This suggests that if the ninety-nine days is not the correct figure, it is very close. It is interesting to note that the compiler has used the Latin form of the name (Pupienus, as ‘Pupenius’), not the Greek (Maximus), which indicates a Latin source rather than a Greek one.

65. Gordian III: five years, five months, and five days §

Accepted Chronology: May/June 238 to mid-Jan./mid-March 244 (Kienast, 195), which yields five years and eight/ten months, or early August 238 to late January/early February 244 (Peachin, 29–30), which yields five years and six/seven months. The Egyptian papyrological evidence, and to a certain extent the numismatic evidence, seem to support Peachin’s late dates (see Rathbone 1986: 110–11), but other epigraphic and legal evidence suggests a date of early June for Gordian’s accession. Sartre 1984 argues for early May on the basis of an inscription from Sakkaia, Syria, explicitly dated to 27 May 238, which appears to name Gordian alone as emperor in an erasure. This is unusual since Gordian did not suffer *damnatio memoriae* (though his predecessor Maximinus did), but Sartre claims that the name can nevertheless be read. However, as we have seen above, Maximinus was probably still alive at the end of March 238, making 27 March simply far too early for Gordian III’s having been acknowledged as augustus in Sakkaia (later Maximianopolis), which was deep in the desert east of the Sea of Galilee. Gordian’s actual *dies imperii* would therefore have to have been months earlier, perhaps even before the

29 Pupienus in Latin and Maximus in Greek. See the overdone complaints, repetition of both names, and constant explanations in *HA Duo Maximini* 33.3–4, *Tres Gordiani* 10.1, 19.9, 22.1; *Max. et Balb.* 1.2, 11.1, 15.1, 4–6, 16.2, 16.6–18.2.

seas closed in the autumn of the previous year, for news of his accession to have reached Sakkaia by 27 March, and that is simply too early in view of the evidence we have seen above. Maximinus' name would accord better with the distance from Rome, the date, and the erasure. Sartre dismisses the possibility of Gordian's name having been engraved within the erasure as a replacement, but that must be considered a possibility in view of the other evidence.

Chronologies

Uniquely, no source gives any figure other than six years.

Commentary

George the Monk and Cedrenus split the reign into two, assigning four years to Gordian and two to his son Οὐνίωq/Οὐνίωqος (461.13–18 = 451.11–14), apparently a corrupted form of Ἰουνίωq (see § 63 above).³⁰ Symeon the Logothete mentions Gordian only with Maximus and Balbinus (75.3–4).

The unanimity of all sources but the *Breviarium* on Gordian's reign is most surprising, and one is inclined to suppose that he did indeed reign for exactly, or nearly exactly, six years, but this places his death far too late in 244 to accommodate the chronology of later emperors. However, if we assume that the six years includes not only Gordian's time as caesar, but also the reigns of Gordian I and II and Balbinus and Pupienus, who are missing from so many lists, and was therefore counted from late March 238, Gordian's death would probably fall in February/March of 244, which is consistent with the chronologies of Peachin and Kienast.

The *Breviarium*'s total is the only different one, since its source instead attributed the reigns of Gordian I and II and Balbinus and Pupienus to Maximinus, who did in fact survive into the reigns of the latter two emperors. Its unique figure for Gordian III is therefore probably counting Gordian's reign alone, and so close to the correct figure, which must have been somewhere around five years and seven or eight months. Since this duration has the same number of months and days as the years and months of the following reign (five), one suspects some kind of contamination for both.

66. Philip I and II: five years, five months, and twenty-nine days §

Accepted Chronology: mid-Jan./mid-March 244 to Sept./Oct. 249 (Kienast, 198), which yields five years and six/nine months. Another possibility is late Feb./early March 244 to September 249 (Peachin, 30–1), which yields five years and five months.

30 Both authors also follow the Gordians with almost identical descriptions of a pair of non-existent emperors, Marcus (a philosopher), who allegedly reigned for three years, and Iustil(I)ianus, who reigned for two (465.1–6 = 451.16–19). On these, see Banchich 2009: 91 nn. 32 and 33. Now Zonaras (12.18, p. 582.14–21) and *Syn. chron. A* (36.31–37.4) describe an emperor they name Σεῦῆqος Ὀστυλιανός and Οὐστυλιανός ὁ Σεβήqος respectively. This person is the precursor to Iustilian, and the name is a corrupted version of Hostilian the son of Decius. However, in George, Cedrenus, and Zonaras the details of the death of Iustilian/Hostilian are taken from the death of Quintillus (see below). (Malalas) also has a Marcus in this spot, with six years, but no Iustilian (436.12). See also the next note for a further connection among Cedrenus, George, and Malalas.

Chronologies

Seven years: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 217 and *HE* 6.39.1, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 506, Syncellus 443.16, Nicephorus 94.21, *Chron. syn.* 101.17, *Anon. matr.* 53.6, *Syn. chron. B* 17.21;(,?) Cedrenus 451.20. This is an unusually large error for Eusebius.

Six years: Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 14, *Chron. pasch.* 502.6, *Lib. chron.* 433.17, George the Monk 465.8, *Chron. epit.* 24.22.

Six years and six months: (Malalas) 436.13; *Syn. chron. A* 37.5.

Five years: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 28.11, Eutropius 9.3, *Epit. de caes.* 28.1), John of Antioch 172, p. 328.18; Symeon the Logothete 76.2. John's figure is likely drawn from Eutropius.

Five years ('some say') or six years and six months ('others say'): Zonaras 12.19, p. 584.21–2.

Commentary

This is the first time we see a connection among Epiphanius' *Ancoratus*, *Chron. pasch.*, *Lib. chron.*, George the Monk, and *Chron. epit.* This close relationship can be seen for Philip, Decius, Gallus and Volusian, Gallienus and Valerian, Claudius, and Probus.

The *Breviarium* appears to be roughly correct, although it does play a role in the establishment of the Peachin's figures (Peachin, 30). Of all the other durations, only that of the *KG*/Zonaras can fit the parameters.

67. Decius: one year, eleven months, and eighteen days §

Accepted Chronology: Sept. 249 to early June 251 (Kienast, 204 and Peachin, 32), which yields one year and nine months. *AE* 2003.1415 shows that Decius died at the very end of May.

Chronologies

Seven years: *Syn. chron. B* 17.22. A dittography from the figure for Philip, above.

Thirty months (= two years and six months): *Epit. de caes.* 29.1.

Two years: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 29.4, Eutropius 9.4), Syncellus 445.3, *Chron. syn.* 101.18, Symeon the Logothete 77.2, Cedrenus 453.6.³¹ *Chron. syn.* may instead be related to Eusebius' *HE* (see below).

Not quite two years: Eusebius, *HE* 7.1, Zonaras 12.20, p. 589.2.

One year and nine months: *Syn. chron. A* 37.23.

31 The order in Cedrenus is as follows: Philip, for seven years; Valerian, for one year; Gallus and Volusian, for two years and eight months; Decius, for two years; Aemilian, for one year; and Valerian and Gallienus, for fifteen years. The order in George is as follows: Philip, for six years; Valerian, for one year; Gallus, for one month; Decius, for one year; Aemilian, for one year; and Gallienus, for three years. The order in (Malalas) is as follows: Philip for six and a half years; Valerian, two and a half years; Gallus 'paruissimus', for five months; Decius, for one year and eight months; Aemilian, for four months; Valerian, for six years; and Gallienus, for fourteen years. In spite of the differences in the years, the close connection among these three sources is obvious. See also the previous note.

One year and eight months: (Malalas) 436.16.

One year and three months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 218, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 507, Nicephorus 94.22, *Anon. matr.* 53.10.

One year: Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 14, *Chron. pasch.* 503.6, *Lib. chron.* 433.18, George the Monk 466.20, *Chron. epit.* 24.27. A rounded version of Eusebius' duration.

Commentary

The sources give varying figures, most indicating somewhere between one and two years. Even Eusebius changed his mind in the time between the composition of the *Chron. can.* and the *HE*, and his 'not quite two years' and the *KG*'s 'two years' mirror the *Breviarium*'s figure.

68. Gallus and Volusian: two years, four months, and nine days §

Accepted Chronology: mid June (?) 251 to August (?) 253 (Kienast, 209) or early June 251 to July/Aug. 253 (Peachin, 35–7), which yield two years and two months.

Chronologies:

Three years: Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 15, *Chron. pasch.* 505.8 ('Gaius Gallus'), *Lib. chron.* 433.19 ('Gallienus'), *Chron. epit.* 24.32; Syncellus 459.16 ('according to some'); *Chron. syn.* 101.19 ('Gallus and his wife, Salonina').

Two years and eight months: Symeon the Logothete 78.2, Zonaras 12.21, p. 591.6, Cedrenus 452.14. Cedrenus also gives one year to a 'Valerian', evidently a corruption of Volusian from another tradition represented more clearly by George the Monk (465.12; see below). See note 30 above.

Two and a half years ('Valerian') plus five months ('Gallus paruissimus'): (Malalas) 436.14–15. See note 30.

Two years and four months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 218, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 546.

Two years and three months: *Syn. chron.* A 37.31. The close relationship between this text and Eusebius' *Chron. can.* demonstrates that this is probably an error for two years and four months.

One year and four months: *Anon. matr.* 53.15, Nicephorus 95.1. The close relationship between these texts and Eusebius' *Chron. can.* demonstrates that this is an error for two years and four months.

Two years: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 31.3); *Epit. de caes.* 30.1; Syncellus 459.16 ('according to others'); *Syn. chron.* B 17.25.

Not quite two years: Eusebius, *HE* 7.10.1; Eutropius 9.5 (= *KG*?).

Eighteen months (= one year and six months): Syncellus 459.15, ascribed to Dexippus, a lost Greek narrative historian whose history ended in 270.

One year ('Vallerian') and one month (Gallus): George the Monk 465.12 and 466.17. See note 30 above.

Commentary

If Dexippus' figure was actually twenty-eight months (= two years and four months) instead of eighteen months ('KH' not 'IH'), it would explain the figure of two years and four months in Eusebius and the *Breviarium*, which would still seem to be about two months too long for modern reconstructions. One suspects that this longer figure originated in a chronology that did not include Aemilian's reign (which would have been true of most lists: see below) and therefore included his duration in the total for Gallus and Volusian, which would therefore extend their 'reign' from late May/early June 251 to late September/early October 253, which is consistent with the chronologies of Kienast and Peachin.

69. Aemilian: eighty-eight days §

Accepted Chronology: July/August to Sept./Oct 253, which yields eighty-eight days (Kienast, 212), or late July to mid-September 253 (Peachin, 36–7), which yields just under two months.³²

Chronologies

Aemilian is omitted by all Greek emperor lists.

Three years: Syncellus 465.24. No doubt an error for three months, which probably derives from Eutropius.

One year: George the Monk 467.7, Cedrenus 454.1.

Four months: (Malalas) 436.17; Symeon the Logothete 79.2; *Syn. chron. A* 38.9.

Fourth month: *Epit. de caes.* 31.2; John of Antioch 174, p. 330.14.

Not quite four months: Zonaras 12.22, p. 592.3.

Three months: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 31.3, Eutropius 9.6, Jerome, *Chron. can.* 219^e).

Commentary

Syncellus' three (months) is unique for a Greek source and probably derives from Eutropius. The figure in the *Epit. de caes.* seems to derive from a Greek source, not from the *KG* (see Appendix 2). So we seem to have a split between a Western, Latin tradition (three months), which derives from the *KG*, and an Eastern, Greek tradition (four months, or just under, if we can accept Zonaras' extra detail).

The eighty-eight days of the *Breviarium* (= two months and twenty-eight days, and thus closer to the Western tradition) is exactly the same as the duration of Florian (§ 68, below). It is unlikely that two third-century usurpers lasted for exactly eighty-eight days,³³ and as a result, since Florian's figure is supported by the inde-

32 Peachin (p. 37 n. 6) is quite wrong in thinking that when a source says 'three months' it can refer to portions of three months, in this case July (end), September (all), and October (beginning), even though the actual duration is assumed to be only two months from mid July to mid October. Calculations were made as set out at the beginning of this chapter.

33 Although Nepotian and Silvanus are both given reigns of twenty-eight days in the fourth century, I think it probable that the duration for Silvanus was copied from Nepotian's in the *KG*, the only source for that figure, since Silvanus never was an emperor or usurper.

pendent testimony of Eusebius, the eighty-eight days here is probably a dittography, intentional or otherwise.

70. Valerian and Gallienus: fourteen years, four months, and twenty-eight days §#
Accepted Chronology: June/August 253 to September 268 (Kienast, 214 and 218), which yields fifteen years and one/three months, or mid Sept. 253 to early Sept. 268 (Peachin, 37–8 and 39–40), which yields just under fifteen years.

Chronologies

Sixteen years (Valerian and Gallienus) + nine years (Gallienus): *Syn. chron. A* 38.15 and 20. This is probably meant to be like the *KG* chronology (below).

Fifteen years (both): Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 220 and *HE* 7.28.4 (Gallienus only), Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 15 (Gallienus), *Lib. chron.* 433.20, Syncellus 465.6, Nicephorus 95.2, *Chron. syn.* 101.20, *Anon. matr.* 54.1, Symeon the Logothete 80.2, *Syn. chron. B* 17.26, Zonaras 12.25, p. 602.14, Cedrenus 454.3, *Chron. epit.* 24.33; *HA Carus* 3.5.

Fifteen years (Gallienus) = six with Valerian + nine alone: *KG* (= Aur. Victor 32.5, 33.35, Eutropius 9.11.1 [who gives no duration for Valerian], *HA Duo Gall.* 21.5).

Fifteen years (Valerian) + fifteen years (Gallienus = seven with Valerian + eight alone): *Epit. de caes.* 32.1, 33.3.

Six (Valerian) + fourteen (Gallienus): Malalas 12.26 and 27.

Fourteen years (Valerian): *Chron. pasch.* 505.14.

Twelve years (both): Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 547. An error of ‘B’ for ‘E’.

Six years (Valerian): John of Antioch 177, p. 334.3.

Three years (Gallienus): George the Monk 467.10.

Commentary

Syn. chron. A’s sixteen is an error for six, and is thus exactly the same as the *KG*’s figure with some additional confusion. Malalas’ figure was no doubt originally the same.

The *Breviarium* is far too short and almost certainly more corrupt than the majority of its figures for third-century emperors.

71. Claudius Gothicus: one year, four months, and fourteen days §

Accepted Chronology: Sept./Oct. 268 to Sept. 270 (Kienast, 231), or early Sept. 268 to mid August 270 (Peachin, 42–3), which yields one year and eleven months/two years.

Chronologies

Nine years: Malalas 12.28. No doubt this is a corruption of the one year and nine months that is found in Eusebius (below).

Eight years: *Syn. chron. A* 38.30.

Two years: Eusebius, *HE* 7.28.4, *Chron. pasch.* 508.3; George the Monk 467.15, Cedrenus 454.11.

Under two years: Eutropius 9.11.2.

One year and nine months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 221, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 560, Nicephorus 95.5, *Chron. syn.* 101.21, *Anon. matr.* 54.5, *Syn. chron. B* 17.28; *Epit. de caes.* 34.1.

One year: Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 15, *Lib. chron.* 433.21, Syncellus 469.16, Symeon the Logothete 81.2, *Chron. epit.* 25.1.

One year ('some say') or two years ('others, like Eusebius, say'): Zonaras, 12.26, 606.3–4.

Commentary

The figure of four months in the *Breviarium* is probably an error for nine ('IIII' for 'VIII'), which agrees with Eusebius and the *Epit. de caes.*, as well as Malalas (months have become years) and Eutropius (= *KG*?).

72. Quintillus: seventy-seven days §

Accepted Chronology: Sept. 270, seventeen days (Kienast, 233), or late August to mid Sept., twenty-seven days (Peachin, 43, from Rathbone 1986: 122).

Chronologies

Quintillus does not appear in Greek emperor lists.

A few months: Zosimus 1.47. This is the only chronological note in book one.

Twentieth day: *HA Aurelian* 37.6. This must be a rounded version of seventeen days (see below).

Seventeen days: *KG* (= Eutropius 9.12, Jerome, *Chron. can.* 222^b, *HA Claudius* 12.5), Malalas 12.29, Syncellus 469.22, Zonaras 12.26, p. 606.1.

Seven days: George the Monk 467.17, Cedrenus 454.19, *Syn. chron. A* 39.5–6.

A few days: *Epit. de caes.* 34.4; manuscripts PHK of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 102, line 8). Both of these are no doubt generalizations of seventeen days, the former from the *KG*.

Commentary

Malalas, Syncellus, and Zonaras are all known to have used Eutropius, whose text (or that of the *KG*) is almost certainly responsible for introducing the duration of seventeen days into the Byzantine tradition. George the Monk, *Syn. chron.*, and Cedrenus derive from a common, related source that had lost the 'I' from 'IZ'. The basic description of Quintillus' accession and death is found in the *HA* (*Aur.* 37.5–6) and in the Greek traditions, i.e. Zosimus (above), John of Antioch (179, p. 334.13–16), Symeon the Logothete (mss PHK, above), Zonaras (above), Cedrenus (above), and *Syn. chron. A* (39.3–8), as well as George the Monk and Cedrenus when describing the death of 'Iustilianus' (465.5–6 and 451.17–19; see n. 30 above). This account of Quintillus is first found in the *HA* and then Zosimus, whose source at this point is unknown (see Blockley 1981: 2 and 98 n. 5), but was probably Eunapius, since we know that the *HA* and Zosimus used Eunapius as a major source.

Given the volume of Quintillus' coinage from the Western mints, a reign of seventeen days (or 'a few days') is quite simply impossible, in spite of the arguments of Rathbone 1986: 121–2 (see Peachin, 43; Cubelli 1992; Watson 1999: 222;

and *RIC* 5.1, pp. 201 with 239–47).³⁴ This makes the original figure of the *Breviarium* much more likely to be correct, since it roughly agrees with Zosimus (‘a few months’), who is witness to much the earliest source for this reign. Furthermore, it is easy to see how ‘LXXVII’ could be corrupted into ‘XVII’, but much harder to explain the reverse (and we have explicit examples of ‘17’ becoming ‘7’). As we shall eventually see, there is no precedent in the *Breviarium*’s account for an error of this magnitude. On the other hand, nothing compels us to accept the complete accuracy of the *Breviarium*’s figure. The ‘seven’ is certainly correct, but the first part does not necessarily have to be seventy. Sixty-seven (‘LXVII’) is also a likely candidate to describe Zosimus’ few months, accounting well for the variant palaeographically, both for losing the ‘L’ (which would leave the ‘XVII’ of the *KG*) and for gaining the ‘X’ (which would result in the ‘LXXVII’ of the *Breviarium*).

Furthermore, the two earliest sources for Aurelian attribute five years and six months to his reign (Eusebius, *Chron. can.* and *Epit. de caes.*; see § 73, below). The source for this figure did not include Quintillus (he is absent from Eusebius³⁵ and has been quickly added to the end of the account of Claudius by the compiler of the *Epitome* from the *KG*). The *Breviarium*, on the other hand, includes Quintillus and attributes five years and four months to Aurelian, two months less than Eusebius and the *Epitome*, exactly the length of time required for Quintillus (see Table 10 in Chapter 6 below). So Zosimus and the *Breviarium* would seem to be more correct, with roughly two months (= sixty-seven/seventy-seven days), than the *KG* with its seventeen days.

73. Aurelian: five years, four months, and twenty days §

Accepted Chronology: Sept 270 to Sept./Oct. 275, which yields five years/five years and one month (Kienast, 234); or mid to late August 270 to mid September/early December 275, which yields five years and one/four months (Peachin, 43–4). Another possible chronology is that proposed by Watson 1999: 47, 104, 221–5: second half of September 270 to late October 275, yielding five years and one month.

34 There are no papyri dated to the reigns of Quintillus or Florian (Rathbone 1986: 121 and 126), yet there are for other such short-lived emperors as Gordian I and II, Pupienus and Balbinus, Aemilian, and Tacitus (Rathbone 1986: 109–10, 115–17, 125). Tetrachms were struck in Alexandria for all these emperors, with the exception of Florian, who must not have been recognized in Egypt. Based on my own quick examination of die identities from on-line auction-house photographs, the output of Alexandrian tetrachms issued in the name of Quintillus is quite small in comparison to that of, for example, the short-lived Gordian I and II, which corresponds to the lack of evidence for Quintillus’ name in Egyptian dating formulae. I suspect, therefore, that news of Quintillus’ accession was very late in arriving in Egypt, and that the Egyptian evidence cannot be used to estimate the length of his reign. See Poole 1964: 304 and Milne 1971: 102 for the Alexandrian coins.

35 Jerome himself added the entry describing Quintillus (222b), which is therefore asterisked in Helm’s edition.

Chronologies

Six years: Eusebius, *HE* 7.30.22, Malalas 12.30, *Chron. pasch.* 508.9, *Lib. chron.* 433.22, Syncellus 469.25 and 470.25, *Chron. epit.* 25.3, *Syn. chron.* A 39.9; John of Antioch 183, p. 338.10; Symeon the Logothete 82.2, Cedrenus 455.1.

Six years lacking a few months: Zonaras 12.27, p. 608.3–4.

Six years short a few days: *HA Aurelian* 37.4. This is emended in the Teubner edition to the expected ‘five years and six months short a few days’ (p. 177.8–9; see *Epit. de caes.* below)

Five years and seven months: *Syn. chron. B* 17.29. Probably an error for the following.

Five years and six months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 222, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 561, Nicephorus 95.6, *Chron. syn.* 101.22, *Anon. matr.* 54.9; *Epit. de caes.* 35.1.³⁶

Five years: George the Monk 467.19.

Four years: Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 16. For some reason this is emended to fourteen years in the *GCS* edition.

Commentary

George or his source has probably just rounded down the ‘six months’ of Eusebius, *Chron. can.*, and the months figure in *Syn. chron. B* has probably been corrupted slightly from the same figure. If Zonaras and the *HA* are relying on the same ultimate source (Eunapius), the ‘days’ of the *HA* is incorrect and should be ‘months’.

There are major conflicts both among the literary sources, which indicate five and a half and six years, and among the modern reconstructions, which indicate between five and five and a third years. Again, the *Epit. de caes.* mirrors Eusebius (five years and six months), indicating that it used a Greek source rather than the *KG*. As noted above, the difference between this Greek duration and that of the *Breviarium* could be accounted for by the inclusion of a two-month reign for Quintillus in the Greek source.

74. Tacitus: eight months and twelve days §

Accepted Chronology: Nov./Dec. 275 to July 276, which yields eight to nine months (Kienast, 250); or mid September/early December to June 276, which yields six to nine months (Peachin, 46–7).

Chronologies:

Two years: Symeon the Logothete 83.2, Zonaras 12.28 p. 608.20 (‘not quite two years’, ‘according to others’), Cedrenus 463.7.

Nine months (for Tacitus [six months] and Florian [three months] together): *Chron. epit.* 25.4.

Seven months: Malalas 12.31; *Syn. chron. A* 39.18. A version of the following rounded up?

36 Kienast, 234 mistakenly cites Eutropius 9.15, too, as indicating five years and six months, but Eutropius gives no duration at all.

Two hundred days: Aur. Victor 36.2; *Epit. de caes.* 36.1 (= KG? See Appendix 2) = six months and twenty days.

Not quite reaching the seventh month: Zonaras 12.28, p. 608.19 ('according to some'). This looks like another version of 200 days.

Six months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 223 (omitted in *HE* 7.30.22), Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 561 and *Ancoratus* 16, Syncellus 471.1, Nicephorus 95.7, George the Monk 476.10, *Chron. syn.* 101.23 (with Probus), *Anon. matr.* 54.11, *Syn. chron. B* 17.31; John of Antioch 184, p. 340.10.

Within the sixth month: Eutropius 9.16; *HA Tacitus* 13.5, 14.5 (six months). This may be a simplification of what was in Victor and the *Epit. de caes.* (= KG?).

Commentary

The *Chron. pasch.* omits Tacitus and goes directly from Aurelian to Florian (509.1–2). Eusebius omits Tacitus and Florian in the *HE* and goes from Aurelian to Probus (7.30.22).

The general tradition, led by Eusebius, Zonaras, Victor, and the *Epit. de caes.*, almost unanimously agrees on six months (or almost seven), which would seem to be too short. The *Breviarium*'s figure is longer than this tradition, apparently more in accordance with the non-literary evidence, but as usual we have no means of determining its validity.

75. Florian: eighty-eight days *

Accepted Chronology: July to September 276, which yields eighty-eight days (Kienast, 252); or June to August 276, which yields two or three months (Peachin, 47).

Florian does not appear in most lists.

Relevant Chronologies

Ninety-seven days: *Chron. pasch.* 509.2.

Three months (extrapolated): *Chron. epit.* 25.4 (see Tacitus, above).

Not quite three months: Zonaras 12.29, p. 609.3. Three months is ninety days, and so this may derive from Eusebius.

Eighty-eight days: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 223^e (omitted in *HE* 7.30.22), Syncellus 471.2.

Two months and twenty days (= eighty days): Eutropius 9.16, John of Antioch 185, p. 340.14–15. John is following the common Byzantine tradition (noted below) that combined Florian and Probus, but is the only source of that tradition to give Florian a regnal duration, which he has added from Eutropius.

Other Chronologies

One or two months: Aur. Victor 37.1.

Scarcely two months: *HA Tacitus* 14.2, 5.

Sixty days: *Epit. de caes.* 36.2. The figures in the *HA* and the *Epit. de caes.* are the same and may derive from Eunapius, a source that both are known to have used.

Two months: Malalas 12.32; George the Monk 476.13. This is the same as sixty days.

One month: *Syn. chron. B* 17.32.

Florian is noted as reigning with Probus, but his regnal duration is not given separately by Zosimus 1.64, Symeon the Logothete 84.2, Cedrenus 463.11, and *Syn. chron. A* 39.22 (where Florian is presented as an usurper).

Commentary

The *Breviarium*'s figure of eighty-eight days is correct, as can be seen from Eusebius, and this is supported by Zonaras (unless his ultimate source is Eusebius) and Eutropius. The other common tradition is two months.

76. Probus: six years, two months, and twelve days §

Accepted Chronology: July(?) 276 to Sept./Oct.(?) 282, which yields six years and two to three months (Kienast, 253); or June 276 to September/9 December 282, which yields six years and three to five months (Peachin, 47).

Chronologies

Seven years: *Lib. chron.* 433.23 (Probus and Tacitus combined).

Six years and four months: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 223, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 562, Syncellus 471.3, Nicephorus 95.9, *Anon. matr.* 54.12; John of Antioch 187, p. 342.20.

Six years and one month: *Syn. chron. B* 18.1.

Six years: Eusebius, *HE* 7.30.22, Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 16, *Chron. pasch.* 509.5, George the Monk 476.16, *Chron. syn.* 101.23 (with Tacitus); *Chron. epit.* 25.5; *Epit. de caes.* 37.1.

Just under six years: Aur. Victor 37.4; Zonaras 12.29, p. 610.18–19.

Fifth year: *HA Probus* 21.3.

Three years and three months: Malalas 12.33.

Two years and four months: manuscripts F₁PHK of Symeon the Logothete (*app. crit.* p. 103, line 2), Cedrenus 463.11. This is probably a corruption of Eusebius' figure.

Two years: Symeon the Logothete 84.2, *Syn. chron. A* 39.21.

Commentary

Eusebius and John of Antioch (apparently not relying on Eusebius here), as well as the *Syn. chron. B*, closely agree with the *Breviarium*, which is in accord with the modern reconstructions.

77. Carus: ten months and five days §

Accepted Chronology: Aug./Sept. 282 to July/August 283, which yields nine to twelve months (Kienast, 258); or Sept./9 December 282 to July 283, which yields seven to ten months (Peachin, 48).

Chronologies: Carus alone

Two years: *Epit. de caes.* 38.1; Malalas 12.34, *Syn. chron. A* 40.6.

One year: George the Monk 476.19, *Chron. syn.* 101.24.

Chronologies: Carus, Carinus, and Numerian together

Not quite three years: Eusebius, *HE* 7.30.22, Zonaras 12.30, p. 612.6–7.

Three years: *Chron. pasch.* 509.15. No doubt a rounding of Eusebius' *HE* figure.

Two years: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 224, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 563 and *Ancoratus* 17, Syncellus 471.14–15, Nicephorus 95.10, *Anon. matr.* 55.3–4, *Syn. chron. B* 18.4 (Numerian), *Chron. epit.* 25.6; Aur. Victor 39.12; *Lib. chron.* 433.24 (includes Florian); Symeon the Logothete 85.2, Cedrenus 464.6.

Commentary

Eusebius is the likely source of all the combined figures, with the exception of Aur. Victor and (probably) the *Lib. chron.*

George and *Chron. syn.* are the only ones that give a figure close to that of the *Breviarium*, which seems to be roughly correct.

78. Numerian and Carinus: two years, eleven months, and two days §#

Accepted Chronology: Carinus: spring 283 to Aug./Sept. 285; Numerian: July/August(?) 283 to Nov. 284, which yields two years and four to five months (Kienast, 260–1).³⁷ Alternately, Carinus: spring 283 to spring 285; Numerian: July 283 to Nov. 284, which yields two years (Peachin, 49–50).

Chronologies

Four years: Malalas 12.35–6, *Syn. chron. A* 40.9 and 14 (two years for Numerian and two for Carinus).

Three years: George the Monk 477.2 and 6, *Chron. syn.* 101.25–6 (two years for Carinus and one for Numerian).

Commentary

Again, George and *Chron. syn.* are the only texts that have figures that approach those of the *Breviarium*, although they have Carinus and Numerian following Carus individually, without an overlap. But it may be just coincidence, since Malalas may be the ultimate source here.

To judge from Eusebius' 'not quite three years' for all three emperors together (*HE* 7.30.22), which is virtually identical to the *Breviarium*'s chronology here, it would seem that the *Breviarium*'s duration was originally intended as the duration of Carus, Numerian, and Carinus not just the latter two, though two and half years would seem to be closer to the truth. Once again, we can see that the author of the *Breviarium* has added inconsistent figures from different sources (in this case, the duration for Carus).

79. Diocletian and Maximian: twenty-one years, eleven months, and twelve days # (††)

Accepted Chronology: Diocletian: 20 Nov. 284 to 1 May 305 (Barnes 1982: 4, 49, 56), which yields twenty years, five months and eleven/twelve days. A count from the death of Carinus in c. April 285 (which this duration may be counting from) would yield twenty years and one month.

37 This is incorrect because it follows Chastagnol's erroneous totals, which are based on the *Breviarium*, but I cite it anyway. See Chastagnol 1980: 79–80 and Barnes 1982: 50.

Chronologies

Twenty-five years: *Epit. de caes.* 39.1.

Twenty-two years: George the Monk 477.10, Cedrenus 464.14.

Twenty years and nine months: Malalas 12.37.

Twenty years: Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 225, Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 564 and *Ancoratus* 17, *Chron. pasch.* 510.18, Theophanes 6.7, Nicephorus 95.14, *Chron. syn.* 101.29, *Anon. matr.* 55.8, Symeon the Logothete 86.2, *Syn. chron. B* 18.5, Zonaras 12.32, p. 618.4, *Chron. epit.* 25.7, *Syn. chron. A* 40.27; Aur. Victor 39.48.

Nineteen years and four months: *Lib. chron.* 433.26 (for a tetrarchy of Constantians, Licinius, Maximian, and Diocletian).

Commentary

If we discount the days figure, we can see that George the Monk (along with Cedrenus who copies him) offers a similarly incorrect chronology to the *Breviarium*, as does the *Epit. de caes.*, whose wildly incorrect number is probably a result of corruption ('XXII' to 'XXV'). The error in believing that Diocletian ruled for twenty-two years seems to arise from an awareness of the celebration of his *vicennalia* (twentieth anniversary) in Rome in 303 (November), and from knowledge of his retirement in 305 (May), yielding a round two years. Unfortunately, as was the custom, the *vicennalia* marked the beginning of Diocletian's twentieth year, not the end (he became emperor in 284), and there is only a year and a half between the celebrations and his retirement. We can see this reckoning set out explicitly in Eusebius, *HE* 8.13.9–11, where he describes two years of persecution between the *vicennalia* and Diocletian's retirement.

However, if we count simply from Diocletian's accession on 20 November 284 to Maxentius' accession in Rome on 28 October 306, we get twenty-one years, eleven months, and eight days, a figure so close to the duration here for Diocletian and Maximian (lacking only four days) that this calculation must be its genesis. This is not, then, the length of the reigns of Diocletian and Maximian, although the compiler appears to have thought it was, but the time between the *dies imperii* of Diocletian and that of Maxentius. Constantius' short reign between May 305 and July 306, which he spent in northern Gaul and Britain, as been either ignored or forgotten. This duration does not synchronize with that for Numerian and Carinus, however, since that figure counts to the defeat of Carinus in the spring of 285.

From this point on, the dominance of Constantine as the most important emperor of the period for our sources, the overlapping reigns of widely scattered emperors, and the frequent treatment of those emperors as usurpers or otherwise illegitimate by their successors and later literary texts means that there are very few indications of regnal duration for the remaining emperors listed in the *Breviarium*, and those that we do have from other sources are only expressed in full years and tend to differ from one another quite considerably. For instance, Constantius was a stable and always legitimately-regarded Western emperor, whose reign was later commemorated by Constantine. He was caesar for twelve years and augustus for one, for a total of thirteen years, as Eutropius alone correctly notes (10.1.3). In the literary sources, however, there is general agreement that he was caesar for thirteen

years, and his time as augustus is stated to have been an additional one, two, three, or four years (see, e.g., Aur. Victor 40.11; Symeon the Logothete 87.2; *Syn. chron. B* 18.7–8; *Anon. matr.* 56.9, with Galerius and Constantine; *Chron. epit.* 25.20, with Galerius). On the other hand, Jerome gives him a total reign of sixteen years (*Chron. can.* 228^e), Eusebius twelve years (§ 18; Burgess 1999: 62 and 101), and *Chron. syn.* nine years (101.27). Nevertheless, in most cases we know the exact or approximate durations of these reigns, and so we can still evaluate the figures of the *Breviarium*. When it comes to chronology, therefore, the problems of the third century extend into the early fourth, and in fact they become even worse because of the overlapping reigns, lack of detail, and frequent confusions in the surviving sources, as I have noted above. Without such later sources as the *Descriptio consulum, consularia* composed for the most part in the fourth century, many of these early fourth-century dates would be as uncertain as those for the third-century emperors, or in some cases even more so.

80. Constantius and Galerius: sixteen years, eight months, and twelve days #

Accepted Chronology: Constantius: 1 March 293 to 25 July 306 (Barnes 1982: 4, 60–1), which yields thirteen years, four months, and twenty-four/five days. Galerius: 1 March 293 to late April/early May 311 (Barnes 1982: 4, 6, 62, 64), which yields eighteen years and two months.

Commentary

Constantius and Galerius did not reign together as a pair like Diocletian and Maximian, so it is incorrect to link them in this manner. As can be seen, Constantius predeceased Galerius by almost five years. The compiler seems not have known this, however.

Jerome records that Constantius reigned for sixteen years (*Chron. can.* 228^e). Eusebius gave him twelve years, so that cannot be the source for Jerome. Eutropius gives him thirteen years (10.1.3), so it looks as though Jerome's 'XVI' is a simple scribal error for the 'XIII' that must have originally appeared in the common source, the *KG*.³⁸ This erroneous figure then forced Jerome to backdate Constantius' accession as caesar: it appeared under year nine of Diocletian in Eusebius (§ 6; Burgess 1999: 60); Jerome pushed it back to year five (225^e).

The same scribal error could lie behind the sixteen years in the *Breviarium* as well, which would then imply that the duration belongs to Constantius only, not Galerius, or that the compiler thought that they both ended their reigns at the same time. Such a conclusion is an easy straw to grasp at because of Jerome's error, but we have no idea how likely it is here. The year figure could still be an error of 'XVI' for 'XVII' (or 'XVIII' or something else).

The rest cannot be determined, but the twelve days may be a dittography from Diocletian's figure above (or *vice versa*).

38 Manuscript M of the *Chron. can.* has the same error in reverse here: 'XIII' for 'XVI'.

81. Severus: three years, four months, and fifteen days #§

Accepted Chronology: 1 May 305 to March/April 307 (Barnes 1982: 5, 65), which yields one year and ten or eleven months. The date of 16 September 307 for his death (as, e. g., in Barnes 1982: 5 n. 13; Kienast, 290; Nixon and Rodgers 1994: 181) derives solely from the *Breviarium* and has no validity.

Commentary

There is nothing here of any value.

82. Maxentius: six years *

Accepted Chronology: 28 Oct. 306 to 28 Oct. 312 (Barnes 1982: 12), which yields six years exactly.

Commentary

This is an easy figure to get right, and since we assume the compiler lived in Rome, it should have been the easiest figure to obtain and reproduce correctly.

83. Maximinus: nine years, eight months, and six days #

Accepted Chronology: 1 May 305 to 30 April 313 (defeat near Adrianople; Barnes 1982: 5, 65, 67), which yields seven years, eleven months, and twenty-nine/thirty days.

Commentary

There is nothing of value here.

84. Licinius: fifteen years, four months, and sixteen days #

Accepted Chronology: 11 Nov. 308 to 19 Sept. 324 (Barnes 1982: 6, 7, 80, 82), which yields fifteen years, ten months, and eight/nine days. The *Breviarium* may in this case be dating to Licinius' defeat at Adrianople on 3 July, which would yield a figure of fifteen years, seven months, and twenty-two/-three days.

Commentary

The figure of fifteen years is correct, at least.

6. SUMMARY

I. SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC RESULTS

Let us begin with a summary of the more specific conclusions that have arisen in the course of the foregoing analysis.

1. The sole ancient tradition for Julius Caesar's 'reign', found in the *Breviarium*, Josephus, Theophilus, Clement, Eusebius, and *Syn. chron. B*, was calculated from the battle of Pharsalus (§ 35).
2. Some historians, like Dio and the author of the *KG*, calculated Augustus' reign from Actium, as we would; but the main tradition, found in Theophilus, Clement, and the *Breviarium*, counted from his first salutation as *imperator* on 16 April 43 BC. After all, from the point of view of the second century and later, *imperator* was the word for emperor. Josephus, followed by Eusebius, counts from the death of Caesar (§ 36), so that there is a continuous reckoning of chronology from reign to reign.
3. Josephus dates the end of Augustus' reign and the beginning of Tiberius' to 16 September, twenty-eight days after Augustus' death and one day earlier than the modern extrapolated date for Tiberius' *dies imperii* (§§ 36 and 37). This supports the general view that a formal acceptance of *imperium* was made, or was believed to have been made, by Tiberius on 17 September.
4. Dio misdates Tiberius' death and therefore Gaius' accession by ten days, probably because his source had suffered a scribal error and gave the date as *VII kal. Apr.* instead of *XVII kal. Apr.* His duration figures are based on this incorrect date and are correctly calculated. It may well be, of course, that it was Dio's source who did the calculation and that Dio simply repeated his totals; we cannot know (see Appendix 1 § 1.1) (§ 37).
5. The major tradition for the chronology of Claudius (§ 39) appears to be the result of a dittography of the days from the duration of Nero, and dittography seems to be at the root of a number of other particular traditions for Nero (§ 40, two), Otho (§ 42), Vespasian (§ 44), Titus (§ 45), Decius (§ 67), Aemilian (§ 69), and Constantius (§ 80). A double dittography or transposition has occurred between the figures for Macrinus and Elagabalus (§§ 59–60). Such dittographies show that many of the original sources for these works must have been emperor lists, where names and durations appeared side by side or one above the other, and not narrative accounts, where the durations would have been separated by long stretches of text. This will be discussed below.
6. Nero committed suicide on 9 June 68 (§ 40).
7. Galba was proclaimed augustus by the army on 2 April 68 (§ 41).
8. There are three variant traditions for Otho's reign: ninety days (ninety-one days rounded to three months then expressed as days); ninety-one/two days, which

- counts the length of Otho's reign from his accession to death; and ninety-five days, which counts between the accessions of Otho and Vitellius (§ 42).
9. There are three variant traditions for Vitellius, one counting from his military proclamation (2 January; Dio), one from Otho's death (16 April; Josephus), and the third from his official acceptance by the senate (19 April; e.g. Suetonius, Clement, *Breviarium*, and Eutropius) (§ 43).
 10. Dio's calculation for Vitellius is incorrect because it counts to 22 December instead of 20 December. See Appendix 1 § 9.4 (§ 43).
 11. Vespasian died on 23 June. There are no grounds for altering this date, which is found in Suetonius. Titus became emperor on 24 June (§§ 44–5).
 12. For the *Breviarium*'s duration of Domitian's reign, the days figure became months and a later tradition combined the two earlier traditions, as follows with witnesses in brackets: fifteen years and five days (Dio) → fifteen years and five months (Eusebius) → fifteen years, five months, and five days (Theophilus, Clement, and the *Breviarium*; § 46). As can be seen, the evidence for the third step (Theophilus) is earlier than the earliest evidence for the first (Dio) and second steps (Eusebius). There is evidence for what appears to be the same type of corruption in the chronologies for Marcus Aurelius, as follows: nineteen years and eleven days (Theophilus, Clement, Dio) → nineteen years and eleven months (Malalas, Nicephorus, *Syn. chron.* A, often corrupted) → nineteen years, eleven months, and eleven days (corrupted to eighteen years, eleven months, and fourteen days in the *Breviarium*; § 52). The same is true for Severus Alexander: thirteen years and nine days (*Lib. gen.*, *KG*) → thirteen years and eight months (Symeon the Logothete) → thirteen years, eight months, and nine days (*Breviarium*; § 61). Something similar may have happened with the duration for Tiberius as well, as his twenty-two years, six months, and twenty-eight days was influenced by a rounded twenty-two years and seven months to produce the twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-eight days that we see in Tertullian, the *Lib. gen.*, and the *Breviarium* (§ 37). This type of hypercorrection is exactly what we should expect from documents such as emperor lists, as will be discussed below.
 13. There is an explicit tradition in the *Chron. pasch.* (supported by the unrelated Eutropius) that Nerva died on 25 January. Its origin is unknown. The chronologies of Theophilus, Clement, and Dio count to 28 January for Nerva (supported by the *Epit. de caes.*) and from 28 January for Trajan (supported by Eutropius), which, in light of the *Chron. pasch.*, must therefore be the correct date for the death of Nerva, rather than for the *dies imperii* of Trajan. Since Nerva died in Rome and Trajan was in Cologne at the time, the two events cannot have occurred on the same day, although that is the implication of the chronologies. The frequently repeated date of 27 January for Nerva's death in modern accounts (or even 'during the night of 27/28' January, Bennett 1997: 53) is derived from Dio without accounting for his calculation error with the Roman date (see Appendix 1 § 1.1) (§ 47).
 14. There are two surviving traditions for Trajan's reign, one dating his death to 9 August (Ps-Symeon), the other counting his reign to the accession of Hadrian

- on 11 August (Theophilus, Clement, Dio, Eutropius; § 48). The *Breviarium* gives the explicit date of 9 July, but it is incorrect, and there is no easy method of emending it.
15. The evidence suggests that Marius Maximus mistakenly assigned Hadrian an extra year (twenty-one years instead of twenty), corrupting the later Latin traditions in the *KG* and *HA* (§ 49).
 16. Dio mistakenly calculates Hadrian's reign to 11 July instead of 10 July. See Appendix 1 § 9.6 (§ 49).
 17. The traditions for the duration of the reign of Antoninus Pius are few and particularly corrupt, even in usually reliable texts: for months, we see figures of three, seven (correct), and eight; and for days, six/seven (combined with the related seven/three months) as well as the correct twenty-five corrupted to twenty-two and twenty-eight (with the eight months) (§ 50). There is no obvious way to explain these variants.
 18. The reign of Verus is assigned two quite different durations, nine years and eleven years, and both are wrong. Neither seems to be a mistake for what the actual duration ought to be, around seven years and ten months. Cedrenus' unique duration (ten years and nine months) may be the origin of the duration of eleven years and could derive from Dio, although we would expect more accuracy from him (§ 51). The figures in the *Breviarium* seem to be very close to what we would expect (seven years, eight months). The compiler seems to show no cognizance of the fact that Verus ruled along with Marcus Aurelius.
 19. In addition to the correct tradition, there is a well-attested tradition for Commodus that gives him eight months instead of nine (§ 53).
 20. There are two strong traditions for Pertinax: one counting to 26 March (*Breviarium*, *HA*, *Epit. de caes.*; *Lib. gen.* [duration for Didius Julianus]), the apparent date of his death; and the other to 28 March (Dio, Malalas; *HA* [provides date]), the apparent date of Didius Julianus' accession, a gap noted by Herodian (§ 54).
 21. The chronologies of both Didius Julianus and Septimius Severus mark the date of the deposition and death of Julianus as 1 June (§§ 55–6).
 22. The exact day of Geta's death cannot be conclusively determined, but was probably 19 December (§ 57). The compiler seems to show no cognizance of the fact that Geta ruled along with Caracalla.
 23. There appears to have been an erroneous variant chronology for Caracalla that gave his days figure as two instead of four (perhaps reading Δ [= 4] as $\Delta Y \Omega$), thereby dating his death to 6 April instead of 8 April (Dio, *Lib. gen.*, and *HA*). There is no evidence to support 8/9 April as Caracalla's *dies imperii* (as in Kienast 162) (§ 58).
 24. Elagabalus' reign is counted to 14 March 222, the accession of Severus Alexander, and no source allows us to date his death, which must have occurred on the thirteenth or earlier (§ 60).
 25. Maximinus' official *dies imperii* was 23 March, and his reign was calculated to the senatorial acceptance of the proclamation of Gordian I as emperor at the very end of March or very beginning of April 238 (§ 61). The *Breviarium*'s figure for Maximinus' reign seems to include the reigns of Gordian I and II and

- Balbinus and Pupienus, even though they are listed separately. Other sources appear to attribute these months to Gordian III (see no. 28 below)
26. A Latin source that was aware of only two Gordians (I and III) and called them 'Gordianus senior' and 'Gordianus iunior' seems to lie behind some of the Byzantine accounts of Gordian I and II, most of which are hopelessly corrupt. This could well be the *KG*, since it cannot be Eutropius, who says almost nothing about Gordian I and does not call Gordian III 'Gordianus iunior'. The *Breviarium* is by far the earliest surviving literary witness to two Gordians in Africa and their twenty(-two)-day reign, traditions that only show up much later in Malalas, Symeon the Logothete (assigned to Maximus and Balbinus), Zonaras (assigned to 'Maximus and Albinus' as well as Gordian I), and *Syn. chron. A*, which may or may not be related to Malalas or his source. Malalas, seemingly correctly, ascribes twenty-two days to Gordian I and twenty days (once corrected) to Gordian II (§ 63). The *HA* has details about Gordian I and II from Greek sources, but says nothing about the length of their reigns.
 27. Balbinus and Pupienus seem to have ruled for approximately ninety-nine days (§ 64).
 28. It is surprising that every single source, with the exception of the *Breviarium*, agrees that Gordian III reigned for exactly six years, a unanimity not found for any other emperor; yet his reign cannot have been much longer than five years and eight months. It therefore seems that the figure of six years includes the four months of the reigns of Gordian I and II and Balbinus and Pupienus, and thus counts from March 238 to March 244 (§ 65).
 29. The eighty-eight days attributed to Aemilian by the *Breviarium* is identical to the length of Florian's reign and should probably be rejected as a dittography. Western sources give him a reign of three months (with which the *Breviarium* seems to agree), Eastern sources four months, and these figures are probably the closest we can come to his correct duration (§ 69).
 30. Quintillus must have reigned for more than seventeen days, and the evidence suggests roughly two months. A duration of sixty-seven days best accounts palaeographically for the figures of seventeen days in the *KG* and seventy-seven days in the *Breviarium*, and for the evidence of the non-literary sources, but there is no certainty (§ 72).
 31. Florian ruled for eighty-eight days (§ 75).
 32. The duration assigned to Carinus and Numerian in the *Breviarium* seems to include Carus' reign, but is still too long by about four months (§ 78).
 33. The duration of the reign of Diocletian and Maximian is, in reality, counting the time between the *dies imperii* of Diocletian and that of Maxentius (§ 79). Thus there is a gap between the end of the reign of Carus (c. July 283) and the beginning of the reign of Diocletian (20 November 284), a period of one year and four months, that has been filled with a duration for Numerian and Carus of two years and eleven months. The gap between the end of the reign of Diocletian and Maximian (1 May 305) and the accession of Maxentius (28 October 306), a period of one year and six months, has been added to the end of the former's reign.

34. The serious confusion found in the *Breviarium* from the reigns of Carinus and Numerian to the end is mirrored in the other surviving sources. Only the figures for Maxentius' reign and the years of Licinius are without serious error of one sort or another. My belief is that historians had no better sources for the early fourth century than they did for the third, but that the general sequence of individual emperors in the third, coupled with the use of a consular list (all major emperors were consul), allowed them to have some sense of roughly how long each emperor ruled, in spite of the facts that the reigns of many emperors overlapped somewhat and the chronology was complicated by many short reigns. But from Carus onwards, there were many emperors ruling at the same time for long periods in different and remote parts of the empire, and it became simply too difficult to keep track of them all. The result is chronological confusion in the sources.
35. The oft-quoted date for the death of Severus II, 16 September 307, has no validity (§ 81).
36. Ancient historians often counted between the *dies imperii* of emperor A and the *dies imperii* of emperor B to determine the length of the reign of emperor A, thus extending the count of A's reign beyond his death (labelled '1' in the notation below). This makes perfect sense, since it was often easy to find such accession dates in calendars, *ferialia*, and other such sources, and in many cases these events were celebrated annually in Rome long after an emperor's death. There are also examples of emperor B's reign being counted between the death of emperor A and the death of emperor B, thus extending the count of emperor B's reign before his accession (if he was not appointed or recognized until some time after A's death), or cutting off any period of reign that emperor B may have had before the death of emperor A ('2', below). We can see examples of these different counts for Augustus (1), Tiberius (1), Caligula (2), Galba (2), Otho (1), Vitellius (1, 2), Vespasian (1), Titus (2), Nerva (1), Trajan (1), Commodus (2), Pertinax (1), Didius Julianus (2), Septimius Severus (2), Geta (2), Caracalla (2), Elagabalus (1, 2), and Severus Alexander (1). These examples demonstrate that we cannot always assume that a duration figure accurately counts the length of an emperor's reign from *dies imperii* to death, as a modern reckoning would do. I suspect that, in at least some cases where modern tradition indicates that death and succession happened on the same day and we have no explicit date for the death, there could have been a longer gap between the two than is usually recognized. Similarly, during the third century, especially between 235 and 285, many reigns overlapped, and so any list of true regnal years (unless calculated solely between the official senatorial *dies imperii* of each emperor) should therefore considerably exceed the total number of calendar years. As we can see below (Tables 7, 9, and 10), this is not the case; the total number of regnal years from three quite different witnesses actually amounts to only slightly more than the total number of calendar years, which suggests that for the most part official senatorial *dies imperii* were being taken into consideration as much as was possible, rather than the dates of military acclamations. Furthermore, as we have seen above, in some cases the reigns of short-lived

emperors were incorporated into the durations of their longer-lived predecessors or successors. These quirks of counting have not until now been given proper consideration when using the regnal chronology provided by the literary sources.

37. We can see many clear errors transmitted from now-lost and unknown common sources to later surviving sources. Sometimes evidence appears quite late in the Byzantine traditions, yet an imperial text can show that it must have existed considerably earlier. A good example is provided by the reign of Severus Alexander (no. 12, above). The *Breviarium* has the incorrect figure of eight months (a mistake for nine days), yet the evidence that this was an error in the tradition and not just the *Breviarium* itself does not appear until Symeon the Logothete in the middle of the tenth century. There is also the case of the reign of Caligula, where the unrelated Josephus, Theophilus, Tertullian, and *Breviarium* all agree on assigning him eight months instead of the correct ten months, which is found in Suetonius and Clement. A shift from ten to eight is not an easy or obvious scribal error in either Latin or Greek and so cannot explain the frequent appearance of the incorrect number. There must have been an important common source earlier than Josephus (who was writing under Vespasian) that spread this incorrect figure to so many later sources, since there is no evidence that Josephus himself was the source (which is still a possibility, of course).
38. This comparison also reveals a hitherto unrealized situation. While one might assume that a writer would have one source for a specific group of emperors and simply copy it, it seems clear from the evidence presented above (and in the appendices below) that writers had access to many lists and collections of data and would jump from source to source, for no reason now obvious to us. This is particularly true for the evidence of Eusebius, which exerted such a tremendous influence on all later Byzantine chronography. Many later historians follow Eusebius for most or much of their accounts, but then substitute different figures seemingly at random. The same can be seen with the correlations between and among even texts that tend to have more accurate figures: Theophilus and Clement often agree, but they also disagree in ways that cannot be attributed to simple manuscript corruption, showing that although they may sometimes appear to be relying on the same ultimate source (or even Clement on Theophilus), the collection of such data, whether on their part or on that of their sources, was much more eclectic than we have hitherto assumed. Theophilus and Clement agree with one another (allowing for corruption in either tradition) for the emperors in §§ 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50?, and 52, and disagree over those in §§ 37, 38, 42, 43, and 45.
39. It is also interesting how often the corruptions of Greek figures can be traced back to Latin errors; such mistakes as 'III' for 'VI', 'VIII' for 'VIII', and 'XXII' for 'XXXII' are surprisingly common. It would seem that even for Greek writers, the immediate or ultimate sources for such information were still in Latin, and that Latin was the major language that transmitted Roman history and the data for Roman history even well into the third century, as we can see from Dio, who used Roman dates exclusively (see Appendix 1).

II. GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE *BREVIARIUM* ANALYSIS

Let us now turn to a summary of the general conclusions that relate to the *Breviarium* itself, beginning with a review of the conclusions of the analysis in Chapter 5 with regard to the basic textual accuracy of the figures in the *Breviarium*.

Table 4
Summary of Textual Accuracy of Figures

* = accurate (4/50)

- 35. Caesar
- 55. Didius Julianus
- 75. Florian
- 82. Maxentius

*† = accurate report of erroneous or variant tradition (4/50)

- 36. Augustus
- 37. Tiberius
- 42. Otho
- 61. Severus Alexander

Accurate: 8/50 = 16.0%

† = apparent minor corruption (4/50)

- 43. Vitellius
- 49. Hadrian
- 58. Caracalla
- 63. Gordian I and II

†† = apparent minor corruption of erroneous or variant tradition (7/50)

- 38. Caligula
- 39. Claudius
- 41. Galba
- 46. Domitian
- 50. Antoninus Pius
- 54. Pertinax
- 60. Elagabalus

Minor Corruption: 11/50 = 22.0%

= major corruption (16/50)

- 40. Nero
- 44. Vespasian
- 45. Titus
- 47. Nerva
- 48. Trajan

- 52. Marcus Aurelius
- 53. Commodus
- 56. Septimius Severus
- 59. Macrinus
- 70. Gallienus and Valerian §
- 78. Carinus and Numerian §
- 79. Diocletian and Maximian
- 80. Constantius and Galerius
- 81. Severus §
- 83. Maximinus
- 84. Licinius

Major Corruption: 16/50 = 32 %

Total Corruption: 27/50 = 54.0 %

§ = no verdict (but appear to be roughly correct) (15/50)

- 51. Lucius Verus
- 57. Geta
- 62. Maximinus
- 64. Pupienus and Balbinus
- 65. Gordian III
- 66. Philip the Arab and Philip II
- 67. Decius
- 68. Gallus and Volusian
- 69. Aemilian
- 71. Claudius Gothicus
- 72. Quintillus
- 73. Aurelian
- 74. Tacitus
- 76. Probus
- 77. Carus

No verdict: 15/50 = 30.0 %

If we remove the unknown (§) reigns from the comparisons above (18 in total), the percentages become 25 % (8/32) accurate and 75 % (24/32) corrupt. Our totals for the Alban kings were one third to two thirds, respectively, so it would seem that, as expected, the appearance of triple numbers (years, months, days) has reduced the overall accuracy, though perhaps not as much as we might have expected.

We can also look at these data in terms of the durations that are reported accurately and with minor corruptions. This gives us a total of nineteen out of thirty-two, which is 59.4 %. So we can be reasonably sure that almost two-thirds of the figures are correct, or are at least close to the correct figures.

We can look at these data another way: broken down by year, month, and day. In the following table I have included only the emperors for whom we have data, and have noted where the corruption lies. I have treated the variant regnal traditions as correct.

Table 5
Corrupt Figures for Known Durations

o – accurate
- – minor corruption
x – corrupt
(blank) – no figure

Emperor	Years	Months	Days	Fully Accurate
Julius Caesar	o	o	o	o
Augustus	o	o	o	o
Tiberius	o	o	o	o
Caligula	o	o	-	
Claudius	o	o	-	
Nero	-	x	o	
Galba	-	x		
Otho			o	o
Vitellius		o	-	
Vespasian	x	x	x	
Titus	x		x	
Domitian	x	o	o	
Nerva	x	o	-	
Trajan	o	x	x	
Hadrian	o	o	-	
Antoninus Pius	o	o	x	
Marcus Aurelius	-	o	x	
Commodus	x	x	-	
Pertinax			-	
Didius Julianus			o	o
Sept. Severus	o	x	x	
Caracalla	o	o	x	
Macrinus	o	x	x	
Elagabalus	-	o	-	
Sev. Alexander	o	o	o	o
Gordian I and II			-	
Florian			o	o
Diocletian	-	x	o	
Constantius	x	x	x	
Maxentius	o			o
Maximinus	x	x	x	
Licinius	o	x	x	
Corrupt:	11/25	11/25	20/31	
Error rate:	44.0 %	44.0 %	64.5 %	
Correct:				8/32 25 %

The twenty-five percent accuracy rate is admittedly not very high. But the real question here is why the day figures should be more corrupt than the year figures. There is no pattern in the incidence of corruption and there is no reason why the day figures should be any more corrupt than the year or month figures given (1) the way that Roman numerals work, (2) the sort of corruptions with which we are faced here, and (3) the actual numbers involved in these corruptions. The likeliest explanation is that many of the day figures, perhaps as many as a third of those listed here, were never accurate to begin with because they were simply invented. Some of the compiler's data included day figures and some did not, and rather than just leave the days blank, the compiler filled in random numbers.

This hypothesis can be confirmed by comparing the actual day figures that we know from durations that also have years and/or months noted with the day figures provided by the *Breviarium*. These latter should be completely random, even if they have been corrupted in transmission, either before or after the compiler first copied them out. First of all, the actual figures that we have calculated for the emperors above, including a number of major variants, produce the following string: 0, 1, 3, 3, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 8, 10, 10, 11, 12, 12, 14, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 25, 27, 27, 28, 29, 29. Given the small number of emperors we are dealing with, this is about as random an assortment as one might expect, though there are four sixes and only one number between fourteen and twenty. We can compare these with the figures for reigns and lives from Dio (including the incorrect figures): 0, 0, 3, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 9, 10, 11, 13, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 19, 20, 20, 20, 20, 22, 22, 23, 24, 25, 25, 26, 26, 26, 27, 27, 28, 28. This roughly what we see with the first string, though almost half of the numbers are in the twenties and we have a few numbers between 14 and 20. Two numbers repeat four times (4, 20). The figures from the *Breviarium*, on the other hand, are as follows: 0, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, 9, 9, 11, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 14, 14, 14, 15, 15, 16, 18, 18, 20, 27, 27, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 29. Here we can see a distinct predilection for twelve and twenty-eight, and a gap between twenty and twenty-six that we do not see in the other strings. Twenty-four of forty-two of these numbers, 57%, are accounted for by 12, 14–15 and 27–29, 20% of the numbers (0–29). This jumps to 71.5% if we include two and five (two often and easily confused numbers in Latin), for a total of 26.5% of the numbers. This is the fingerprint of forgery.

If we look at Eusebius' *Chronici canones*, we can see that Eusebius was often able to add months to bare year figures, and in three instances was even able to add days (see Table 6 below); so we can imagine that even if the author of the *Breviarium* had a much, much larger number of month and day figures than Eusebius did, he still cannot have had day figures for every single emperor. The figures noted above show that he may indeed have been lacking them for up to half his durations.

Let us look at the problem another way. One source above all others is for the most part ignored by modern scholars when establishing the regnal durations of the emperors, namely Eusebius' *Chronici canones*. Why this should be is unknown, since overall his chronology is extremely accurate when counted over decades and centuries, and it provides the earliest surviving account of the chronology of the

third century, since the version witnessed by the surviving translations and fragments was completed in 325. Furthermore, Eusebius was, via Jerome's Latin translation, the basis for the first scholarly attempts to establish the chronologies of the Roman Empire in the sixteenth century by humanists like Baronius and Scaliger, who were fully aware of Eusebius' great chronological value. Let us compare the accuracy of the *Breviarium*, the modern 'gold standard' for the chronologies of the third century in particular, with that of Eusebius, the most neglected source for the same period. I shall only compare the chronologies where we are certain of the actual figures. To help even the balance, since Eusebius only thrice notes any day figures, I shall only compare years and months in the following table, even though I list days as well. Figures omitted by Eusebius I have registered with a '-'. I have included Eusebius' eight months for Vitellius from the *Historia ecclesiastica*, since the figure does not appear in the *Canones*.

Table 6
The Breviarium Compared to Eusebius, Chronici canones

* – exactly correct (years and months only)

bold – closest to the actual total (years and months only); in the case of a tie, both are bold

italics – incorrect by a year or more

Emperor	<i>Breviarium</i>	Eusebius	Reality
Julius Caesar	3/7/6*	3/7/-*	3/7/6
Augustus	56/4/1*	57/6/-	56/4/3 57/5/4
Tiberius	22/7/28	23/-/-	22/5/27
Caligula	3/8/12	3/10/-*	3/10/6
Claudius	13/8/27*	13/8/28*	13/8/19
Nero	14/5/28	13/7/28*	13/7/27
Galba	0/8/12	0/7/-*	0/9/13 0/7/6
Otho	0/0/90*	0/3/-*	0/0/91
Vitellius	0/8/11*	0/8/-*	0/8/1
Vespasian	12/8/28	9/11/22*	9/11/22
Titus	8/0/12	2/2/-*	2/2/20
Domitian	17/5/5	15/5/-	15/0/5
Nerva	5/4/1	1/4/-*	1/4/10
Trajan	19/4/27	19/6/-*	19/6/12
Hadrian	20/10/14*	21/-/-	20/10/29
Antoninus Pius	22/8/28	22/3/-	22/7/25
Marcus Aurelius	18/11/14	19/1/-	19/0/10
Commodus	16/8/12	13/-/-	12/9/14
Pertinax	0/0/75	0/6/-	0/0/87
Didius Julianus	0/0/65*	-	0/0/65
Sept. Severus	17/11/28	18/-/-	17/8/3

Caracalla	6/2/15*	7/-/-	6/2/4
Macrinus	1/4/2	1/-/-	1/1/28
Elagabalus	6/8/18	4/-/-	3/9/26
Sev. Alexander	13/8/9	13/-/-*	13/0/9
Florian	0/0/88*	0/0/88*	0/0/88
Diocletian	21/11/12	20/-/-	20/5/11
Constantius	16/8/12	12/-/-	13/4/24

Results:

Closest	10	18
Incorrect	8	1
Exactly correct	9*	13*
Out of	28	27

Clearly Eusebius is more accurate than the *Breviarium*.

Let us now compare the combined extent of time for the durations noted above, days included. For the *Breviarium*, the actual extent of time covered by adding up the reigns of the emperors listed above is 312 years, seven months, and thirteen days. Over that same period the *Breviarium* counts 335 years, seven months, and three days, a difference of twenty-three years and two months. Its major errors are twelve years for Vespasian instead of nine, seventeen for Domitian instead of fifteen, five for Nerva instead of one, sixteen for Commodus instead of twelve, six for Elagabalus instead of three, almost twenty-two for Diocletian instead of twenty, and just over sixteen and a half for Constantius instead of thirteen (or for Galerius instead of eighteen). These errors account for twenty-one of the extra twenty-three years.

The actual extent of time covered by Eusebius is 313 years, seven months, and five days (since he calculates the beginning of the reign of Augustus from a date different from that used by the author of the *Breviarium*, as with the beginning of Galba's reign). Over that period, his chronology counts 313 years, seven months, and sixteen days,¹ a difference of only eleven days. Again we can see that Eusebius is considerably more accurate in his reporting of regnal durations than is the *Breviarium*. This is not only because Eusebius had accurate information for the emperors of this period, but particularly because Eusebius was fitting his regnal durations into the established and accurate chronological framework of his chronicle, which provided an overall control for his totals. He knew the reigns covered a certain number of years, and had to fit all his durations into that period. This meant he had to 'fiddle' his chronology in places: he stated that Antoninus Pius ruled for twenty-two years and three months, yet assigned him twenty-three regnal years, and attributed Pertinax's six months to Septimius Severus' first year.²

This cumulative method will allow us to do a check on the chronologies for the third century, since, although we do not know the lengths of the individual reigns,

1 This does not include the six months attributed to Pertinax, since Eusebius counts that as part of Severus' reign (see *Chron. can.* 210^g).

2 For a detailed discussion of this, see Burgess 1999: 28–43.

we do know the beginning and end points of the period we wish to analyse: the accession of Maximinus and the death of Carinus, i.e. 23 March 235 to spring 285 (let us say 1 April to 1 May), thus fifty years and one month. We have seen above that for the period before 235 the day figures are the most corrupt, and if the compiler was given to invention, the third century is the one section of his history in particular where invention was most likely to occur. Let us then ignore the day figures here, except where the days are the only figures for an emperor. These will be converted into months (of thirty days each).

Table 7
The Breviarium Compared to Eusebius, Chronici canones: The Third Century

Emperor	<i>Breviarium</i>	Eusebius
Maximinus	3/4/-	3/-/-
Gordian I and II	0/0/20	-
Pupienus and Balbinus	0/0/99	-
Gordian III	5/5/-	6/-/-
Philip	5/5/-	7/-/-
Decius	1/11/-	1/3/-
Gallus and Volusian	2/4/-	2/4/-
Aemilian	0/0/88	-
Valerian and Gallienus	14/4/-	15/-/-
Claudius Gothicus	1/4/-	1/9/-
Quintillus	0/0/77	-
Aurelian	5/4/-	5/6/-
Tacitus	0/8/-	0/6/-
Florian	0/0/88	0/0/88
Probus	6/2/-	6/4/-
Carus	0/10/-	
Numerian and Carinus	2/11/-	
Carus, Numerian, Carinus		2/-/-

Eusebius' total is fifty years and eleven months,³ which he assigns to fifty calendar years, while the *Breviarium* covers a highly respectable and quite surprising fifty-one years even, only one month longer than Eusebius and a much more accurate total than we saw in the pre-235 comparison above. For the third century, there are ten reigns with year figures; in the reigns examined in Table 6, there are twenty-two, so we would expect an error of ten or eleven years here (just under half of the excess of twenty-three years of Table 6), not just one. Even if we calculate in terms of years, the error here is remarkably low: Table 6 covers 312 years, this table only

3 Eusebius mistakenly assigns Philip seven years instead of five, Decius one instead of two, and Carus and his sons two instead of three. These mistakes therefore cancel one another out. See Burgess 1999: 36.

fifty, so we would expect a proportional excess of just over three and a half years here. In spite of the many overlapping reigns that we know to have existed during the third century, the totals for Eusebius and the *Breviarium* clearly synchronize (or were intended to synchronize) with the actual number of calendar years (this is explored in Table 9, below). As noted above (no. 36), this phenomenon almost certainly arises from an attempt to count between the senatorial *dies imperii* with no regard for how long each emperor actually reigned. The ramifications of this comparison will be discussed below, and a similar comparison that includes other early sources for the chronology of the third century will be set out in Section 2 of Chapter 7 below.

Perhaps one of the most surprising aspects of this study is the large number of independently attested variant traditions for regnal durations to which the *Breviarium* is a witness. Fully eleven of the thirty-one durations in the *Breviarium* for which we have reasonable information (35.5%) reflect variant traditions that seem to have arisen from copying errors and hypercorrections made during the multiple instances of copying the many sources employed by the authors and compilers of the historical texts that appear in this study. Frequent instances of dittography further prove that these sources were mere lists, not histories. We have many examples of such lists from the late Roman and Byzantine periods in both Greek and Latin,⁴ so there is no reason to believe that they did not exist during the first four centuries of the empire. As a result, these variants can give us a window into the existence and circulation of a sub-literary genre of emperor lists that we would not previously have suspected. In addition, from the narrow perspective of the *Breviarium* itself, the identification of these variant traditions permits us to identify as accurate (or nearly so) durations that would otherwise have been deemed corrupt when compared to modern chronological calculations.

These variant durations appear for Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Galba, Otho, Domitian, Antoninus Pius, Pertinax, Elagabalus, and Severus Alexander. It may be that a similar variant tradition lies within the *Breviarium*'s figures for Macrinus (shared with the *Lib. gen.*), but the duration is too corrupt to be certain of the original figures. What is interesting here is that there is no one text that the *Breviarium* tends to parallel, although the similarities do tend to cluster in small groups, as can be seen in the following table.

4 Surprisingly, it is the one type of list that is missing from the original version of the *Chronograph of 354*; even the *Laterculus* of Polemius Silvius, a calendar compilation from mid-fifth-century Gaul, has an emperor list (Mommmsen 1892: 520–23).

Table 8
Variant Traditions in the *Breviarium* and Parallels in Other Texts,
Julius Caesar to Severus Alexander

- 36. Augustus: Theophilus, Clement
- 37. Tiberius: Tertullian, *Liber generationis*
- 38. Caligula: Josephus, Theophilus, Tertullian
- 39. Claudius: Theophilus, Clement, *Lib. gen.*, Eusebius, Epiphanius, *Chron. syn.*
- 41. Galba: Dio
- 42. Otho: Dio
- 46. Domitian: Theophilus, Clement
- 50. Antoninus Pius: *Lib. gen.*?, *Syn. chron* B?
- 54. Pertinax: *HA*, *Epit. de caes.*
- 60. Elagabalus: *Lib. gen.*
- 61. Severus Alexander: (no parallels)

The evidence of this table again emphasizes the eclectic nature of these lists, as we saw in section I no. 38 above. Note too that most of these are Greek texts.⁵ As I noted above in Chapter 2 and discussed in Appendix 4, there are numerous other parallels in the *Breviarium* with texts that only survive in Greek.

For the twenty-three emperors after Severus Alexander, however, it is impossible to determine variant traditions, since we do not know the actual durations for most of these emperors, and most sources only offer figures in full years, rather than years, months, and days.

This observation regarding variant traditions, of course, has ramifications for our study of the Alban kings in Chapter 3. How many of those durations are in fact the result of corruption within the tradition of the *Breviarium*, and how many were in fact already corrupt in the sources employed by the compiler of the *Breviarium*? The evidence for corruption in the names of the Alban kings, such as Aegyptus for Epytus and Titus for Tiberinus, and in the durations of the reigns of the Roman emperors suggests that many of the Alban kings' durations must have already been corrupt.

5 Although the *Liber generationis* is Latin, it is a translation of an originally Greek document.

III. TRIPARTITE ANALYSIS

All the above observations indicate that the durations of the *Breviarium* fall into three groups.

Group One, from Caesar to Severus Alexander

This section is more corrupt than the following section but reports five durations either accurately or with minor corruptions, and eleven others, either accurately or with minor corruptions, that parallel other variant traditions. The base corruption level appears to be about 45 %, but the figures for days are more corrupt than those for the years or months. Since there is no obvious reason why this corruption should arise from the process of copying, the most plausible explanation for this peculiarity is that many of the day figures were simply invented by the compiler to maintain the pattern of years, months, and days throughout the work. This hypothesis is borne out by the non-random clustering of the numbers that appear for the days. This is confirmed by Group Two, below, the account of the third century, where it seems very unlikely that the compiler could have obtained a source that provided day figures. We may suspect that at least some month figures are invented as well.

These figures all seem to derive from the compilation of a variety of regnal lists.

Group Two, from Maximinus to Carus

Even though our conclusion for Group One would lead us to believe that the information for the third century would be even less reliable than that for the first 283 years of the Roman Empire, in aggregate the *Breviarium*'s total extent of years for the period between 235 and 285 is in fact very accurate, and is off by just one year. Nevertheless, the differences among our fourth-century sources show that the *Breviarium*'s sources were not the same as those employed by Eusebius or the author of the *KG* (who were writing c. 311 and c. 359, very close to the same time as the author of the *Breviarium*), although there are still some parallels among the three that must either reflect reality or reveal a common origin (see Table 10 in Chapter 7).

The major problem that we must confront with the year, month, and day regnal durations for the third century in the *Breviarium* is that there was simply no mechanism whereby these figures could have been calculated in the absence of exact *dies imperii* (the basis of most of the duration figures from Caesar to Severus Alexander), and these must have been difficult if not impossible to discover in the first half of the fourth century. The frequent turnover of emperors would have prevented the widespread dissemination and acceptance of most imperial anniversaries, let alone the recording and annual celebration of them; and no anniversaries survived into the fourth century apart from the birthdays of Gordian III, Aurelian, and Probus (D 42,

pp. 239, 253, 255), which were of no value at all to historians. Any early fourth-century historian would therefore have been forced to rely on the chronological research of any available third-century historians, chroniclers, and compilers of *consularia* and emperor lists, since it would not have occurred to Greek and Roman historians of the period to search for epigraphic or documentary evidence. As we have seen above, narrative histories like Herodian's were almost completely useless for these sorts of data, so even though we know of the existence of some narrative histories written in Greek from the second half of the third century, mostly local in nature and covering short periods of time, such as individual reigns or campaigns (see Janiszewski 2006), and even fewer works of Latin history (*HLL* 4, §§ 403–406, pp. 13–66 and §§ 461–5, 327–39), the amount of detailed chronological information that they contained was probably limited. The author of the *Historia Augusta*, writing at the end of the fourth century, certainly did not know of any Latin works covering the third century beyond the *KG*. The biography of Marius Maximus ran out at the beginning of that century, and after that he had to rely on Greek narrative histories that, apart from Dexippus, showed no interest in detailed chronology. And whatever detailed chronological information there was in Dexippus, the author of the *HA* did not bother to record it. If Ammianus Marcellinus' comments on Gordian I and III are to be trusted, he knew of nothing beyond the *KG* or its sources, either. Eusebius, writing at the very beginning of the fourth century, apparently used the contemporary chronicle of Cassius Longinus (which probably concluded with the early 250s),⁶ yet he still seems to have had no access to a source that provided actual dates, though he can offer some month duration figures, which must have been in his sources. Contemporary chronicles could provide the basic years of imperial accessions, perhaps with year and even month durations, but they do not seem to have contained the exact dates of the *dies imperii* that we see in such earlier and later *consularia* as the *Fasti Ostienses*, *Descriptio consulum*, and *Consularia Vindobonensia*.

The evidence that we have seen above shows that from as early as the early fourth century there was virtually no reservoir of quality chronological data that late Roman and Byzantine historians, from Eusebius to Zonaras and beyond, could tap for detailed information about the third century.⁷ Later historians for the most part were happy enough to employ whatever compilations were the easiest to lay their hands on; they had no interest in undertaking long and careful searches of libraries or archives for contemporary histories and documentary evidence. Finding out the exact chronology of third-century events was simply not anything that ever crossed any historian's mind. It was of little concern for them whether an emperor six hundred years earlier had reigned for two years or twenty years (or whether they had

6 See Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 89–90, 348–9 for Cassius Longinus and his chronicle.

7 For instance, Zonaras had a complete text of Dio but quickly opted for the easier-to-use epitome of Xiphilinus instead (see below, Appendix 1 n. 5). He had no access to another classicizing history of a later period either as an original or an epitome (such as Dio's continuator, Herodian, Dexippus, or Eunapius), or to a quality chronicle or emperor list that would have provided detailed chronological information. He just relied on the general traditions of earlier compilations.

reigned at all, as we can see from the examples of non-existent emperors). As a result, whatever sources had existed in the third and early fourth centuries must have been lost.

But another question now arises: how would biographers and chroniclers of the third century have fared in their attempts to gather information for emperors other than long-lived *augusti* like Gordian III, Philip, Valerian, Gallienus, Aurelian, and Probus, especially since few *augusti* any longer resided at Rome and most spent their lives on far-flung frontiers where they both acceded to the throne and died? Added to the problem were the frequent overlaps of emperors' reigns, and the fact that there was often a long delay before the senate accepted a claimant officially and promulgated his name across the empire. The senate could also remove an emperor from power before his death, as was the case with Maximinus Thrax. Thus the period when someone was functionally emperor over a particular territory was usually very different from the period when he was officially emperor of the entire empire, and different historians in different parts of the empire could quite legitimately end up with different durations for the same emperor depending on what information they actually had, no doubt combinations of local oral accounts and whatever information about the official senatorial announcements of each new emperor could be dredged up. We can reproduce this situation today for Egypt by trying to reconstruct the evidence for the promulgation and dissemination of the names of the legitimate emperors there through the papyri (Rathbone 1986). The result is an Egyptocentric view of the third century that in many ways was quite different from what was actually happening within the imperial armies and from what the senate was actually proclaiming. So even if later historians could get their hands on contemporary or near contemporary historical accounts, whatever chronologies they may have offered could easily have seriously conflicted with one another.

Modern historians know so much about the detailed chronology of the fourth, fifth, and early sixth centuries largely, and in many cases solely, because of the day and month dates preserved for the events recorded in surviving *consularia*, such as the *Descriptio consulum* and *Consularia Vindobonensia*, compiled by contemporaries from imperial announcements and local knowledge. These works survive independently, though in fragmentary form, and can also be traced in many other later historical texts that used them as sources.⁸ Although we know that epigraphic *consularia* existed into the last quarter of the second century (the *Fasti Ostienses*) and surviving *consularia* written on parchment first appear in the mid 340s with a detailed account going back to 286 (*Descriptio consulum*), there is, unfortunately, no direct surviving evidence for the compilation of *consularia* during the crucial period of 235 to 285. But given the obvious continuity of this genre in content, structure, and style from the first and second centuries into the fourth to sixth centuries, works of this sort must have been compiled in the third century. The decline of the 'epigraphic habit' in the third century is a well-known phenomenon, and so the disappearance of inscribed *consularia* like the *Fasti Ostienses* needs no special

8 See Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 35–57, 60, 156–84 for *consularia*, both inscribed and written on parchment, from the early imperial period to the sixth century. See also Appendix 4 n. 7.

explanation. We shall see in Appendix 4 that the *Breviarium* displays parallels of content with the *Fasti Ostienses* as well as exact stereotypical verbal parallels with later *consularia*, which suggest that at least some of the material in the *Breviarium* derived from such works, though perhaps only indirectly. The three exact verbal parallels with later *consularia* all are found in entries relating to third- and fourth-century emperors, Maximinus (§ 62), Gallus and Volusian (68), and Maxentius (82), and in one case both the *Descriptio consulum* and the *Breviarium* describe the same famine of 284 in exactly the same three words (see Appendix 4 § 78), the same words used to describe the famine under Maxentius. The source can only be *consularia*. But in spite of these exact parallels between *consularia* and the *Breviarium*, no extant historical text contains so much as a trace of the sort of precise and reliable chronology that *consularia* would have supplied for the third and very early fourth centuries. On the other hand, we do have such exact dates starting in 286 from the surviving *Descriptio consulum*, *consularia* whose earliest recension is dated to just after 342. For some reason it was only in the late fourth and especially fifth centuries that historians and chroniclers began to employ such sub-literary works as *consularia*, in their non-epigraphic form, as useful chronological sources.⁹ But by then, it would seem, there were no surviving copies that extended back before the end of the third century. Even the compiler of the *Descriptio consulum*, writing c. 342 in Trier, had no *consularia* sources for the years between 261 and 285 and so for those years resorts to the barest chronicle-type notes for infrequent accessions and deaths that are simply dated to the appropriate consuls. His detailed evidence only begins when Maximian established his capital in Trier and imperial news, the source for *consularia*, began to be regularly disseminated there.¹⁰

So although there is indirect evidence that *consularia* were probably compiled in one form or another during the third century, there is no evidence that it ever occurred to anyone to use them at the time, and such documents from the third century (and earlier) as did exist do not seem to have survived to have been used by the later historians who would have considered employing them. And if historians in general rarely showed any interest in exact chronologies – Dio and Dexippus seem

9 The best example of this phenomenon is the *Descriptio consulum*: it provides exact day dates and factual details for many important events during the tetrarchy and the reign of Constantine. Such dates and facts would have been invaluable for any historian writing a history of the period; even today, with a few exceptions, the tetrarchic and Constantinian emperors whose dates remain unknown are precisely those whose dates do not appear or are incorrectly recorded in the *Descriptio*. Yet not a single surviving historical work covering this period shows any knowledge of these dates, with the exception of the ecclesiastical history of Socrates, written one hundred years later, and the *Chron. pasch.* of the seventh century, which both depended upon a Greek translation of the *Descriptio*. So if third-century *consularia* did exist, we lack this sort of indirect evidence for their existence as well. Ammianus Marcellinus, who was writing c. 390, is the earliest historian, as opposed to chronicler, who seems to have used a document like the *Descriptio consulum*, perhaps even an actual recension of it. It must also be remembered that the sort of exact chronology that we so desperately seek for the third century was not always highly regarded by Roman historians: see Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 178, 284–5, and esp. 357–8.

10 Barnes 1982: 56–7 and Burgess 1993: 193–4.

to have been exceptions, and Eunapius ridiculed Dexippus for it; see the end of n. 9 above – it seems even more unlikely that the compiler of the *Breviarium* would have gone out of his way to discover the most detailed and accurate chronological texts, given the evidence we have seen for the fabrication of the day dates.

The result of these observations is that it is almost a certainty that the day figures offered by the *Breviarium* for the third century as part of a year, month, day sequence are fictitious. Such figures simply do not seem to have existed in the 330s.

In spite of these problems, however, we have seen above that the *Breviarium* can fit its year and month figures almost exactly into the actual chronological space the reigns originally occupied between 235 and 285. This is definitely not the case for the period from Caesar to Severus Alexander, where the compiler overshoots the actual total by twenty-three years. It seems likely, then, that whoever compiled this chronology was relying on something like a consular list for his overall chronology of the period after Severus Alexander, the last instance of the hypercorrected variant traditions so characteristic of the emperor lists that he used for the earlier period.

Let us assume that the compiler's source did in fact chart his regnal years against a consular list, rounding month figures either up or down in order to deal in units of a full year and adding the lengths of smaller reigns to longer reigns, just as a chronicler like Eusebius did. We saw above that even though Eusebius' raw figures added up to just under fifty-one years, he rounded them into fifty calendar years in his chronicle (marked in Helm's edition as the years 236 to 285). We have seen above that in the *Breviarium* the durations for the emperors from Maximinus progress quite well until Numerian and Carinus (nos. 32–3 and Table 7). That figure includes the length of Carus' reign as well as some extra. We have also seen that the figure for Diocletian and Maximian is actually the time between the accessions of Diocletian and Maxentius. The problem here is that Carinus died in the spring of 285 following Diocletian's accession on 20 November 384. It looks as though what we have here is a unified sequence that ends with Carus and that the duration for Numerian and Carinus is from a different source, slotted rather badly into the space between Carus' death in c. July 283 and Diocletian's accession in November 284. Apart from the sequence of Diocletian and Maximian to Maxentius (284 to 312), the other figures are quite confused, with only the years for Licinius being accurate. These facts strongly suggest that the compiler's basic source concluded with Carus and that the rest was the result of other research that was probably undertaken by the compiler himself. Evidence presented below and in Appendix 4 will confirm this. So let us examine the chronology of this original source to Carus. In the following table I have listed the emperors from the *Breviarium* followed by their durations in years and months; the number of rounded regnal years from those durations, using Eusebius as a guide; the AD equivalent of those regnal years; and finally Eusebius' regnal years with an 'x' indicating emperors he omitted.

Table 9
235–283
The Year-by-Year Structure of *Breviarium*, 235–282

Emperor	Duration	Regnal years = (years AD)		Eusebius
Maximinus	3/4/-	3	(235–7)	3
Gordian I and II	0/0/20	-		x
Pupienus and Balbinus	0/0/99	-		x
Gordian III	5/5/-	5	(238–242)	6
Philip	5/5/-	6	(243–248)	7
Decius	1/11/-	2	(249–250)	1
Gallus and Volusian	2/4/-	2	(251–252)	2
Aemilian	0/0/88	-		x
Valerian and Gallienus	14/4/-	15	(253–267)	15
Claudius Gothicus	1/4/-	2	(268–269)	2
Quintillus	0/0/77	-		x
Aurelian	5/4/-	5	(270–274)	5
Tacitus	0/8/-	1	(275)	1
Florian	0/0/88	-		
Probus	6/2/-	6	(276–281)	6
Carus	0/10/-	1	(282)	

An additional two years for Carinus (283–284) would take us to 285, the first full year of Diocletian's reign. There are roughly forty-eight years and four months between the accession of Maximinus and the death of Carus (late March 235 to late July 283) – we are not exactly sure of the date of Carus' death – and the *Breviarium* assigns forty-seven years and nine months to the same period, a shortfall of only seven months, or a total of forty-eight regnal years (235 to 282 inclusive). However, we have seen in Chapter 5 that the reigns of Maximinus, Gallus and Volusian, and Aurelian already take account of the reigns of Gordian I and II, Balbinus and Pupienus, Aemilian, and Quintillus, and so the nine months of this latter group should not be taken into account in a straight count of calendar years. That reduces the total to an even forty-seven years, a shortfall of sixteen months. Note, however, that the removal of these nine months, because of where they are in the sequence and the totals for the emperors around them, do not affect our hypothetical regnal years. Even so, it must also be remembered that the figures we can now read in the *Breviarium* are likely to have been corrupted somewhat, particularly for the reigns of Gallienus and Valerian, and so they probably do not completely accurately represent what appeared in the original source. Nevertheless, we can also see that over this reduced period the *Breviarium* is actually more accurate than Eusebius (see n. 3, above). Nevertheless, in spite of the sixteen month shortfall, this is an incredibly accurate overall accounting of the chronology of the third century. Neither the earlier nor the later sections of the *Breviarium* can be inserted into a correct chronology so exactly, as can be seen in the next table where I have inserted the the previous fifty-five years, 180 to 234 (235 has been assigned to Maximinus in Table 9),

and following thirty, 283 to 312, into the same system of chronicle-type regnal years. Above we covered forty-eight years, with no errors. Here in the first section I include Eusebius' regnal years bracketed in a smaller font next to those of the *Breviarium* for comparison. These also highlight the errors of the durations in the *Breviarium*, since they cover the period from 180 to 235, an error of only one year (as a result of seven years for Caracalla instead of six). There are no equivalent figures in Eusebius for the second section.

Table 9A
The Year-by-Year Structure of *Breviarium*, 161–235 and 283–312

Emperor	Duration	Regnal years = (years AD)		Real
Commodus	16/8/-	17	(13) (180–196)	(180–192)
Pertinax	0/0/75	-	(1) (192–193)	(193)
Didius Julianus	0/0/65	-	(-) (193)	
Septimius Severus	17/11/-	18	(17) (197–214)	(194–210)
Geta	0/10/-	1	(-) (215)	
Caracalla	6/2/-	6	(7) (217–221)	(211–216)
Macrinus	1/4/-	1	(1) (222)	(217)
Elagabalus	6/8/-	6	(4) (223–228)	(218–221)
Severus Alexander	13/8/-	14	(13) (229–242)	(222–234)
Numerian and Carinus	2/11/-	3	(283–285)	(283–284)
Diocletian and Maximian	21/11/-	22	(286–307)	(285–304)
Maxentius	6/0/0	6	(308–313)	(307–312)

As can be seen, this same method of matching regnal years to consular years has been applied to neither the preceding fifty-five years, which exceed that total by eight years, nor of the following thirty years, which exceed that total by one year. Given the confusion and corruption involving the rest of the post-Carus chronologies, this latter is actually surprisingly accurate, since, as we saw, the individual durations for Diocletian and Maxentius themselves are accurate, once it is understood how they are counted, which is not how the compiler presents them). It is the erroneous duration for Numerian and Carinus that throws the sequence out.

These tables suggest that (1) the compiler of the *Breviarium* was using two distinct sources here, one counting from 235 to 282 and the other from 282 to 312 and (2) the list he used for 235 to 282 was a composite list, one that combined material from a source that counted only major reigns and another that provided the day figures for minor, short-lived emperors. The foundation of list (2) was a text that fit raw year and month figures into a consular list in terms of indivisible regnal years as a means of controlling the individual numbers, which thus implies some degree of massaging and fudging of numbers to get them to fit the schema (as we see Eusebius doing during the third century: Burgess 1999: 36–43). This is what we would expect when no year, month, day figures were available, only year or year

and month figures. This method is exactly what we find in chronicles, especially that of Eusebius, and therefore the source for the chronology of this period was almost certainly a chronicle. Like Eusebius, it attributed the chronology to the major emperors and simply counted the reigns of lesser emperors as part of the major emperors' durations. To the chronology excerpted from this chronicle was added information from some other source – chronicle or *consularia*? – that provided the details of the minor emperors' reigns that were not explicitly set forth in the other source.

It can hardly be a coincidence that the six minor emperors whose reigns are subsumed into the surrounding emperors in the *Breviarium* are exactly those who are not mentioned by Eusebius (noted with an x in Table 9), who is known to have used chronicles as sources for the third century. The major difference is that in the *Breviarium*'s source the first of these four reigns were taken into Maximinus' reign, whereas in every other known source they were taken into the reign of Gordian III (which makes sense when one considers their names).

Such a chronicle must have been Greek, since Latin chronicles of the Hellenistic type that we see in Eusebius with regnal years (as opposed to *consularia* that were dated by consuls and contained exact day dates for accessions) did not exist at the time: the first late-Roman Latin chronicle was not composed by Jerome until 381. Such a Greek chronological source would account for the *Breviarium*'s knowledge of three Gordians as well as the many parallels with Greek variant traditions noted above (Table 8).

The chronology for the period from Maximinus to Carus can therefore probably be attributed to a single source that was compiled from at least two sources, at least one of them, and perhaps both, being a chronicle and therefore Greek. In the form that it was used by the compiler, this list was probably just a continuation of the list used for Group One. I do not see the compiler himself excerpting chronicles for his chronological information.

As we shall see in Appendix 4, the information the compiler had for the manner in which the emperors died and where they died came from a source that also stopped with the death of Carus. It seems a likely conclusion, therefore, that he had all this data from Caesar – durations, manner of death, and death-place – from the same composite source.

Group Three, from Carinus to Licinius

This is by far the most inaccurate part of the *Breviarium*, with few durations resembling the actual chronology. There is only one accurate duration (Maxentius) and only one other correct number (fifteen years for Licinius, the most recently deceased emperor at the time of writing). Individually the figures are overstated for Numerian and Carinus by eleven months, for Diocletian and Maximian by one year and ten months, for Constantius by three years and four months (or understated for Galerius by one and a half years), for Severus by one year and five months, and for Maximinus by one year and nine months, and understated for Licinius by six

months, for a total of eight years and nine months between 283 and 324. However, as we saw above, the duration for Diocletian and Maximian does not count their reigns, but the period between the accession of Diocletian and the accession Maxentius, and it is only overstated by four days. This was no doubt a result of the compiler's having access to only those two dates (20 November 284 and 28 October 306), or variants of them, and nothing else for the intervening period.

The large errors for the contemporary emperors probably arose from the fact that the compiler had no written sources to work from and had to go about obtaining or calculating duration figures for each individual emperor himself, even for those who never ruled in the West, let alone in Rome.¹¹ Since all these reigns overlapped with one another, a straight chronological count of years from the first year of one particular emperor, such as one would find in a chronicle, would not have been of any help in adjusting and controlling the totals. The compiler could no doubt have easily found references to the anniversaries of some contemporary accessions, but not to deaths, and the overlapping system of imperial succession meant he could not rely on the accession date of the next emperor to gauge the length of a reign (and where he did just that, for Diocletian and Maximian, he was wrong). Therefore, trying to find and deploy the raw materials to calculate the durations would have been even more difficult than finding pre-existing figures for the durations themselves. In addition, the anniversaries of Galerius, Severus, Maximinus, and Licinius, all treated as persecutors and/or usurpers by Constantine, would not have survived into calendars and *ferialia* contemporary with the compiler, also making access to their details difficult. As a result, the month and day figures for this section of the *Breviarium* were even more likely to have been invented than those in other sections, since the compiler would probably only have been able to find general year figures for most emperors' reigns. Diocletian had celebrated his *vicennalia* in Rome on 20 November 303 and so that may have ensured that locals were aware of and remembered his accession date, and Maxentius died exactly on the sixth anniversary of his *dies imperii*, a memorable date because of Constantine's simultaneous victory, so these two dates were clearly easier to access than any of the others. But the way he calculated the reigns of Diocletian and Maximian makes it clear he still had no certain idea of what had happened between the abdication of Maximian and the accession of Maxentius.

The durations for this final section, therefore, probably have many multiple sources and some may even have involved calculations undertaken by the compiler himself.

* * *

This variation from section to section within the *Breviarium* shows that we are not looking at a simple process of scribal corruption in the sole surviving manuscript or in the tradition of the *Breviarium* itself. This kind of corruption would run evenly throughout the text regardless of the historical period covered. This is not the case,

11 He found discovering the locations of their deaths much easier, since all but one of these are correct, though some are rather more vague than usual (see Appendix 4).

as is made so clear by the evidence for the third century, whose overall chronology is so careful that it must derive from third century chronicles. The conclusion can only be that the pre-235 durations (and no doubt the largesse figures that follow every regnal duration as well) were already corrupt at the time the *Breviarium* was written because of corrupt sources, insufficiently detailed sources, or a lack of sources. The nature of the variants in Group 1 and the enormous chronological discrepancy overall (over twenty-three years) strongly suggest that regnal lists were the source of these durations. This is to a certain extent confirmed by the fact that the compiler seems to have no knowledge of the fact that Verus and Geta ruled at the same time as Marcus Aurelius and Caracalla. Otherwise he would have noted their reigns like the later third- and fourth-century emperors. The large number of variant traditions, both in the *Breviarium* and in the other texts we have examined, was a result of the copying and recopying of these lists over hundreds of years and of the consequent errors, conflation of different traditions, and hypercorrection made by scribes and readers. The corruption that we can see in the figures indicates that these emperor lists had a high velocity of circulation, by which I mean that they were very popular and so were copied and recopied frequently. This resulted in rapid and compounded corruption. This process shows the abiding historical interest in this period and is a reflection of the many emperor lists that must have been in circulation at the time of the *Breviarium*'s compilation. The phenomena of corruption, cross-contamination, and hypercorrection mirror exactly what we see in the circulation of *fasti* (consular lists) during the empire (see Burgess 2000). These texts were exactly the same type of short, sub-literary documents as emperor lists, and that they should share the same fate through the copying process is not surprising. Another important conclusion of my article mentioned above is that most of the corruption that we see in texts that have come down to us in medieval and humanist copies occurred during copying in the Roman period, not during the Middle Ages as is so often assumed (Burgess 2000: 286). These observations are of some importance, since a study of classicizing narrative histories shows that outside the strictly biographical traditions (and sometimes even in these) very few 'proper' historians paid much attention to detailed chronological minutiae of this nature, yet they are an almost indispensable part of sub-literary genres like *consularia*.

Although it has nothing to do with numbers, I would in this regard like to draw the reader's attention to the death of Romulus (§ 24). Manuscript V says, 'Hic cum natat ad paludem caprae subito nusquam comparuit', 'While he was swimming to the Goat's Pool, he suddenly disappeared.' Manuscript C changes 'ad paludem' to 'in palude': he was swimming 'in the Goat's Pool'. The *Liber de uiris illustribus* says, 'Cum ad caprae paludem exercitum lustraret, nusquam comparuit', 'While he was purifying the army beside the Goat's Pool, he disappeared' (2.13). The version of the *Liber* is consonant with the other varied traditions concerning the disappearance of Romulus and is the only one of these three that is grammatically correct (imperfect subjunctive *vs* present indicative, which is fine with *dum* but not *cum*). Furthermore, the Palus Caprae was in the Campus Martius, where one would purify (or review, as in some versions) an army, and it was not a place that one could swim to or swim in (see Richardson 1992: 70). These facts indicate that the wording of

the *Liber* must be the original. Manuscripts V and C can be only very distantly related (see Chapter 1), and the version of C seems to be an attempt to correct the version of V, so it seems that ‘cum natat ad paludem caprae’ is what the compiler originally wrote; it is not a later error of the V tradition. How ‘cum ad caprae paludem exercitum lustraret’ became ‘cum natat ad paludem caprae’ is unknown; one suspects that ‘exercitum lustraret’ was lost somehow and ‘natat’ added later as an obvious guess as to what someone would be doing ‘ad caprae paludem’ when he suddenly disappeared. Like the apparently erroneous durations that turn out to be accurate versions of variant traditions (Table 8) this account of Romulus’ death is a result of scribal error, confusion, and/or hypercorrection not in the *Breviarium* itself, but in the compiler’s quickly produced, inexpensive sub-literary sources.

The compiler of the *Breviarium* was obviously no high-level historian or chronicler. He was able to get his hands on a few documents that suited his purposes and used whatever he could find to create the small work we have today. He was unable to evaluate the accuracy of his sources, and indeed it may not even have crossed his mind to attempt to do so. His inclination to invent what he did not possess (in the form of the day figures) emphasizes his ‘amateur’ status. His work must stand at the end of a long chain of minor historical texts that were copied and recopied, worked and reworked, stretching back perhaps hundreds of years or more. No doubt many thousands of other would-be-historians did the same thing throughout the late Republic and Roman Empire. What we have may even have been part of a genre recognizable at the time, but which has otherwise disappeared. We shall never know. It just happens that by an accident of history a copy of this one particular compendium has survived.

On top of the fundamental problems of source accuracy and corruption, which affected the quality of the data in the autograph copy of the *Breviarium*, we also have to consider the question of corruption in its own manuscript tradition. With no other complete manuscript to which we can compare Vindobonensis 3416, my comments can only be general.

The *Breviarium* was a popular work, not a serious history, and so was not the sort of text that would have been copied in an expensive edition in a fine book hand. It would have existed within cheap editions quickly copied by less-skilled scribes, like the emperor lists upon which it relied for its data. Because it is such a short work, it could not have stood on its own and must have circulated mainly as a part of compendia of other works. This is what happened in the archetype of the Vienna manuscript, where it was combined with the *Liber generationis* and the *Notitia regionum urbis XIV*, then the *Consularia Vindobonensia* and finally the *Chronograph of 354*. These facts made it unlikely that the *Breviarium* was ever compared with the parent copy so that it could be evaluated and corrected, or compared with other circulating editions to verify the texts. This standard process of reading and emending is one of the ways in which the accuracy of the texts of important classical works was maintained.¹² Indeed, the *Breviarium* is such a small and unexceptional work that there may only be a limited number of generations between the original

12 See Cameron 2011: 421–97.

and the version we now possess, thus limiting the number and severity of any errors. Most errors would therefore have arisen within the first few years of copying, when the work was new and in demand, but without independent witnesses we cannot now identify them.¹³

13 For the history of the text in the Vienna manuscript, see Burgess 2012: 350–1, 368–70, 371, 381–7, 390–5.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

There are five major conclusions from the foregoing analysis.

1. At least some of the day figures for the emperors from Caesar to Severus Alexander are fabricated. Most of those for the remaining emperors are similarly invented and should be completely ignored.
2. The source for the emperors down to Severus Alexander was a regnal list that was already largely corrupt through scribal error and hypercorrection or contaminated from parallel traditions by the time the compiler came to use it.
3. The short section between 235 and 283 is fundamentally accurate, if we ignore the day figures. The chronological information in it probably derives from contemporary Greek chronicles and as a result was probably ‘massaged’ to a certain extent to make it fit its chronological limits.
4. With the exceptions of the reign of Maxentius and the fifteen-year reign of Licinius, the durations from Numerian and Carinus onward, as they are presented, are inaccurate and in some places almost certainly fabricated, so they should be ignored.
5. There are probably corruptions within the text contained in Vindobonensis 3416; but since they lie side by side with earlier corruptions copied from the *Breviarium*’s sources and we have no independent witnesses, these corruptions cannot now be identified.

7. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Under no circumstances should the figures of the *Breviarium* be used alone in historical reconstruction. Even when the figures appear to be approximately correct, we cannot tell exactly where any error may lie, and any data derived from the *Breviarium* simply give a false appearance of accuracy. As we can now see from Appendix 1, even Dio's duration figures contain errors, and they cannot simply be accepted without being understood. In some cases, where the evidence of the *Breviarium* can be confirmed from other sources, we can use it with caution, but never alone. In addition, however, we can now see that there were variant traditions in circulation during the imperial period; therefore, even if the *Breviarium* reports a regnal duration that agrees with one from another source, even Dio, that does not automatically mean that that figure represents historical reality and that the *Breviarium* is not just following a variant (and incorrect) tradition. Using the *Breviarium*'s figures wholesale to determine the length of the reigns of emperors in the third and early fourth centuries with exact days, as Schwartz 1977, Chastagnol 1980, and even Kienast do, is completely invalid and without foundation, and such results must simply be discarded.

With the appropriate application of other reliable evidence to act as a control, however, the evidence of the *Breviarium* can be employed. For instance, the evidence for the length of Geta's reign can probably be accepted because the corruption of his figures in the *Breviarium* can be easily explained, and in particular because of the very narrow window of possibility of only nine or ten days available (between 17 December and 26/27 December; see the commentary on Geta, § 57, above). Given the kind of error that we have seen could have occurred here (as with Nerva, for instance), the fact that the duration is even close to what we would expect is in itself an important confirmation of the *Breviarium*'s underlying accuracy in this case. Emending the text on the assumption of a minor scribal error to provide a specific date (changing ten months and twelve days to ten months and fifteen days, i. e. 'XII' to 'XV', to arrive at 19 December) is probably a reasonable solution in view of what we have seen above, and of the very narrow window within which the figures of the *Breviarium* have to fit. On the other hand, it must not be assumed that this 'proves' that 19 December is an accurate date; it is merely a strong indication of its accuracy. For other emperors, the results are not as encouraging, chiefly because of the lack of corroborating evidence: for the reign of Verus we know too little to emend the text (which for all we know may be perfectly accurate), and for Severus II there is nothing of value to emend.

2. We must throw out every chronological reconstruction that has been tainted by too close a reliance on the *Breviarium*, with the exception of the regnal durations of Geta, Gordian I and II, Florian, and Maxentius. Even in the wake of articles like Rathbone 1986 (which can only give us a view of what was happening in Egypt;

extrapolating his conclusions to Rome in particular is fraught with difficulties), our current reconstructions of the third-century emperors are highly suspect because of the uncritical use of the *Breviarium*'s figures by past scholars. The literary evidence collected above must be employed, but the *Breviarium* cannot be privileged over other contemporary sources just because its year, month, and day record has the appearance of accuracy and precision. That is a sad and sobering conclusion.

The analysis above has shown that, overall, the evidence of the *Breviarium* can be employed together with the other earliest witnesses to the chronology of the third century, namely Eusebius, including not only the *Chron. can.* but also the *HE*, which contains several instances where Eusebius altered his figures for regnal durations, and the witnesses to the *KG*, namely Victor, Eutropius, Jerome, and the *Epitome de caesaribus*, which itself is also witness to another fourth-century Greek tradition. The compilers of the *Breviarium* and the *KG* (by which I mean the earliest recension of the *KG*) and Eusebius were all working within about fifty years of one another (Eusebius c. 311, *Breviarium* 330s, and *KG* c. 359, if not earlier), and they are the earliest and best literary witnesses to the traditions of the durations of the imperial reigns in the third century. The author of the *Epitome de caesaribus* was writing later, at the very end of the fourth century, but he had access to an earlier Greek tradition (via Eunapius) and is still much earlier than our next earliest sources that provide us with figures, namely John of Antioch, c. 518; Malalas, in 565; and the *Chronicon paschale*, in the 630s. Zosimus, writing at the end of the fifth century, seems to have had little interest in chronology and so has no figures apart from an inexact statement about Quintillus. The problems of the *Historia Augusta* are too complicated to allow the unfettered use of its durations for the third century, and what it offers is either little different from the *KG* or fabricated, in spite of the author's use of Greek classicizing histories. There are a few other later texts that provide us with independent traditions for individual emperors, but in general later Byzantine historiography relies very heavily on Eusebius, and on corrupted Eusebian chronological traditions incorporated into chronologies cobbled together from later witnesses to various earlier narrative accounts, mostly unknown. Other traditions from classicizing narrative historians such as Eunapius had some, if perhaps only minor, influence on later historians, if only indirectly, but the general Byzantine traditions were corrupted very early by the addition of apocryphal accounts, duplications, and generic summaries, as well as by mindless recopying from a large variety of chroniclers, compilers, and epitomators with no real critical concern for historical truth or plausibility. The worst example of such Byzantine compilation is the utter mess and wholesale fabrication surrounding the reigns of Gordian I and II and Balbinus and Pupienus (and the various false emperors that follow) in the historians that actually mention them. In such situations, the accurate copying of regnal numbers was consequently very low on the list of concerns for these compilers.

As a result, the earliest witnesses to the imperial chronology of the third century are Eusebius' *Chronici canones* and *Historia ecclesiastica*, the *Breviarium*, and the witnesses to the *KG*, i.e. Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Jerome, the *HA*, and the *Epitome de caesaribus*, of which the latter reports information from at least one other early Greek tradition. The evidence of these texts can be used to determine whether

there is anything in the Byzantine traditions that is worth preserving. But again, just as Egyptian papyri and Alexandrian coinage can only give us the view from Alexandria, these sources can only give us what the readily available sources in the early fourth century said about the third century. Neither perspective is completely accurate.

These three main groups of texts, along with the variants of the *Epitome de caesaribus* and some later Byzantine evidence, can be combined to produce a sort of composite ‘early-fourth-century’ view of the chronology of the third century. We begin by ignoring the day figures of the *Breviarium* and following the agreement of two or more sources where possible for the months (or days, if that is the only figure present). The analysis of Chapter 5 will be my guide where there is no obvious agreement among the sources. The result looks something like this.

Table 10
A Reconstruction of the Durations of the Third Century
based on the Earliest Literary Witnesses

Eus. *CC* – Eusebius, *Chronici canones*

Eus. *HE* – Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*

W *KG* – witnesses to the *KG* (Victor, Eutropius, Jerome, the *HA*, and the *Epit. de caes.*: see Appendix 2)

[] – not counted separately

* – *Epit. de caes.* (where it differs from other *KG* witnesses)

x – ‘a few days’

† – Byzantine sources employed

Emperor	<i>Breviarium</i>	Eus. <i>CC</i>	Eus. <i>HE</i>	W <i>KG</i>	Hypothetical
Maximinus	3/4/-	3/0/0	=	3/0/x	3/0/x ¹
Gordian I and II	0/0/20				[0/0/22†] ²
Pup. & Balb.	0/0/99				[0/0/99†] ³
Gordian III	5/5/-	6/0/0	=	6/0/0	6/0/- ⁴

1 Herodian says that the revolt in Africa broke out at the end of Maximinus’ third year (7.4.1), and Malalas’ figure of three years and ten months may be a corruption of three years and ten days, which would roughly match Eutropius’ figure. The *Breviarium*’s figure looks as though it includes the following four months of Gordian I and II and Balbinus and Pupienus, even though these are listed separately.

2 We have twenty-two (Gordian I) and twenty (Gordian II) days from Malalas and later Byzantine writers, who appear to be copying him or his source (see § 63). This and the next figure are in brackets since they are counted in the reign of Gordian III.

3 The *Chron. pasch.* gives Balbinus a reign of three months (= ninety days) and Pupienus a reign of 100 days, which are approximately the same duration as the *Breviarium*’s ninety-nine days. The ‘three months’ figure also appears in the evidence of (Malalas), Zonaras, and *Syn. chron. A* (see § 64).

4 The six years universally ascribed to the reign of Gordian III is too long, but it probably includes the reigns of Gordian I and II (no doubt somewhat longer than the twenty-two days

Philip	5/5/-	7/0/0	=	5/0/0	5/0/- ⁵
Decius	1/11/-	1/3/0	-2/0/0	2/0/0	1/11/-
				0/30/0*	
Gallus & Volus.	2/4/-	2/4/0	-2/0/0	2/0/0	2/4/- ⁶
Aemilian	0/0/88			0/3/0	[0/3/-]
Val. and Gall.	14/4/-	15/0/0	=	15/0/0	15/0/-
Claudius Gothicus	1/4/-	1/9/0	2/0/0	-2/0/0	1/9/-
				1/9/0*	
Quintillus	0/0/77	-		0/0/17	[0/2/-]
Aurelian	5/4/-	5/6/0	6/0/0	5/6/0*	5/6/- ⁷
Tacitus	0/8/-	0/6/0	-	0/0/200	0/0/200
Florian	0/0/88	0/0/88	-	0/2/20	0/0/88 ⁸
				0/0/60*	
Probus	6/2/-	6/4/0	6/0/0	6/0/0	6/4/-
Carus	0/10/-			2/0/0*	0/10/-
Total Years					48/5

The total number of years here exceeds the actual total of approximately forty-eight years and four months by one month. Given that there was certainly some overlap in these various durations, that we have no idea how each one was calculated, that we are compiling a number of distinct traditions, and that we do not know the exact date of the death of Carus (the *terminus ad quem*) this is a surprisingly accurate total. It now remains for others to apply the epigraphic, numismatic, and papyrological evidence and break these literary figures down into more accurate year and month figures.

As disappointing as it may seem, this is probably the extent of the acceptable use of the *Breviarium* in reconstructing the chronology of the third century. In view of the possibilities for ignorance and contamination in the compiler's sources, the obvious fabrication of numbers by the compiler, and the potential for corruption in the manuscript tradition of the compiler's sources, it is really quite surprising that the *Breviarium* is as accurate for the third century as it has turned out to be.

given by the sources for the reign itself, owing to differences in the amount of time for news to travel to Rome) and of Balbinus and Pupienus, since no account is taken of these reigns in Eusebius or the *KG*.

5 Eusebius is definitely wrong.

6 As noted above, this reign probably includes Aemilian as well, and his figure is therefore in brackets.

7 The figure of five years and six months almost certainly contains the two months I have attributed to Quintillus, and so I have placed his figure in square brackets.

8 I have used a round figure of nine months for the combined total of 288 days indicated here for Tacitus and Florian.

APPENDIX 1. THE IMPERIAL CHRONOLOGIES OF CASSIUS DIO

The chronology of the emperors in Cassius Dio's *Roman History* has been shown throughout Chapter 5 to be a generally accurate accounting of the emperors' reigns, and the same can be demonstrated for his durations of the emperors' lives and ages at accession. Where his evidence can be compared to known dates, he is rarely in error. As a result, in many cases where such dates do not exist, we can rely on his data to calculate the missing chronological information. Our current reliance on Dio's evidence can to a great extent be attributed to Walter Snyder's perceptive article (Snyder 1940a), which set the study of Dio's chronology on a new and much more accurate and reliable footing by demonstrating that many of his peculiar totals derived from calculations that involved the uncorrected use of dates expressed in Roman form, such as *XV kal. Ian.*, rather than, as we would have expected, dates expressed in Greek form, such as 'the eighteenth day of the month December'.

However, Snyder concluded that Dio used a wide assortment of calculation methods which produced six different types of results: Greek exclusive, 'compensative', and inclusive; and Roman exclusive, 'compensative', and inclusive (these terms were explained above in the introduction to Chapter 5). Of these, he indicated his belief in the 'definite possibility' that 'exclusive calculation underlies none of Dio's statements of intervals' (p. 56). Unfortunately, he did not go any further, and made no attempt to ascertain Dio's methods or to compare his results with those of other sources to determine which of Dio's results were based on his own calculations, and which could have been simply copied from others and could thus be the result of a different type of calculation. Furthermore, apart from a few well-known examples, Snyder took no cognizance of the possible problems that might prevent us from being certain of Dio's methods, and he made no attempt to explicate them.

It is my belief that Dio would have used a consistent method to determine his interval figures, and that any variations should be explainable. Where possible, he also would have used reliable totals from other sources, whose method of calculation would be unknown to him. It is the purpose of this appendix to attempt to refine our understanding of Dio's methods, and to solve some of the problems Snyder left unexplained.

I

The method for the analysis is as follows. I have divided each of Dio's calculations, that is the subtraction of one date from another to determine the elapsed time between the two, according to the method required to achieve the result. This depends on whether the first date is earlier or later in the month than the second, and on what

combination of kalends, nones, and ides is involved in the calculation. There are also separate sections for the instances where Dio gives a total number of days longer than a month (usually for short reigns) or notes that an interval lacks a certain number of days from a round figure of months. Corrupt figures are discussed at the very end (§9), though the results of those recalculations are included in the earlier sections. Since my analysis only involves the calculation methods employed for determining the days, I have ignored the year and month figures, which have been dealt with perfectly adequately by Snyder.

The following *sigla* are used before the emperor's name at the head of each entry:

* – Roman calculation only (i.e. a result that arises from an uncorrected calculation with Roman dates)

x – error in text or source

Each entry is divided as follows:

Tiberius – name of emperor

life – indicates whether the duration under analysis is that of the emperor's life or of his reign, or is his age at accession

(58.28.5) – source of figures in Dio

9 days – the day figure from Dio

16 November to 26 March – the dates of the beginning and end of the period under analysis

XVI kal. Dec. to VII kal. Apr. – conversion of these dates to Roman dates

= $16 - 7 = 9$ – calculation of the Roman dates as a mathematical formula (thus all durations are calculated according to the uncorrected Roman method)

A short commentary then follows.

1. Calculation Method 1

This involves a sequence of dates in which both figures are nones, ides, or kalends, and the first number is larger than the second (i.e. earlier in the month). The calculation involves subtracting the smaller number from the larger. The result is a normal count.

1.1. Data

*x Tiberius, life (58.28.5): 9 days. 16 November to 26 March¹ = XVI kal. Dec. to VII kal. Apr. = $16 - 7 = 9$. A Greek calculation would yield ten/eleven days. Roman only.

x Tiberius, reign (58.28.5): 7 days. 19 August to 26 March = XIV kal. Sept. to VII kal. Apr. = $14 - 7 = 7$. A Greek calculation would yield seven/eight days. Greek or Roman.

1 Dio here explicitly dates Tiberius' death to 26 March instead of 16 March (a loss of 'X' in the original Latin date), hence the 'x' designation.

Vespasian, life: see § 9.5, below.

* Nerva, reign (68.4.2): 9 days. 18 September to 28 January = XIII kal. Oct. to V kal. Feb. = $14 - 5 = 9$. A Greek calculation would yield ten/eleven days. Roman only.

Commodus, reign (72.22.6): 14 days. 17 March to 31 December = XVI kal. Apr. to pr. kal. Ian. = $16 - 2 = 14$. A Greek calculation would yield fourteen/fifteen days. Greek or Roman.

Commodus, life (72.22.6): no days. 31 August to 31 December = pr. kal. Sept. to pr. kal. Ian. = 0. A Greek calculation would yield no days. Greek or Roman.

1.2. Extrapolation

Didius Julianus, life (73.17.5): 4 days. We do not know the date of Julianus' birth, and as we saw in Chapter 5, the end of his reign was calculated to 1 June (and the beginning of Severus' from the same day). Dio puts his birthday four months and four days before his death, so his birthday will therefore have been 28 January, using a normal calculation: $x - 1 = 4$, $x = 4 + 1$, $x = 5$ and V kal. Feb. = 28 January (Kienast has 30 January and is counting to 2 June, p. 154). Greek or Roman.

* Elagabalus, reign (79.3.3): 4 days. The problem here is that although we know the date of Elagabalus' accession (8 June = VI id. Iun.), we do not know the date of his death. We know that Severus Alexander was proclaimed augustus on 13 March by the troops, and that his official *dies imperii* was 14 March (*Fer. Dur.* 198), so the date cannot be later than this. Snyder assumed the thirteenth as the date of Elagabalus' death, and forced his calculation to match this result (1940a: 53). Let us simply apply method one to our variables (VI id. Iun. and four days) and see what the result is: $6 - x = 4$, $x = 6 - 4$, $x = 2$, $2 = \text{pr. id. Mar.} = 14 \text{ March}$. As we might have expected, the duration is calculated to the next senatorial *dies imperii*, not the death of the emperor in question. A Greek calculation would yield six/seven days. Roman only.

2. Calculation Method 2

This involves a sequence of dates in which both figures are nones, ides, or kalends, and the first number is smaller than the second (i.e. later in the month [nones and ides] or in the previous month [kalends]). The calculation involves subtracting the smaller number from the larger, and then subtracting the result from the number of days in the last month. It is a mistake to take the number of days in the last month rather than the month before it, but as can be seen below and above in Chapter 5 n. 13 (§ 49 – Hadrian), that is how such calculations appear to have been done. For instance, as can be seen in the example of twenty-five days for Titus below, we are calculating the number of days between 30 May and 24 June (III kal. Iun. and VIII kal. Iul.), and if we use the thirty days of June we get $30 - (8 - 3) = 30 - 5 = 25$. Substituting the correct thirty-one days (for May) results in twenty-six days. For the twenty-eight days of Hadrian we are calculating the number of days between 11

June and 10 July (*III id. Iun.* and *VI id. Iul.*) and the calculation is $31 - (6 - 3) = 31 - 3 = 28$. Substituting the correct thirty (June) for thirty-one results in twenty-seven days. For the following calculations the result is a normal count.

2.1. Data

* Augustus, life (56.30.5): 26 days. 23 September to 19 August = *VIII kal. Oct.* to *XIV kal. Sept.* = $31 - (14 - 9) = 31 - 5 = 26$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-seven/eight days. Roman only.

Caligula, age at accession: see Method 5.1, below.

Caligula, reign: see § 9.1, below.

Nero, reign: see Method 5.1, below.

Titus, age at accession (66.18.4): 25 days. 30 December to 24 June = *III kal. Ian.* to *VIII kal. Iul.* = $30 - (8 - 3) = 30 - 5 = 25$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-five/six days. Greek or Roman.

Hadrian, reign: see § 9.6, below.

Pertinax, life: see Method 5.1, below.

2.2. Exceptions (*i. e. inclusive results*)

Galba, life (64.6.5²): 23 days. 24 December to 15 January = *VIII kal. Ian.* to *XVIII kal. Feb.* = $31 - (18 - 9) = 31 - 9 = 22$. See Murison 1999: 52 and Holzapfel 1912: 491. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-two/three days. Greek or Roman.

Otho, life: see Method 5.3, below.

Domitian, life (67.18.2): 26 days. 24 October to 18 September = *VIII kal. Nov.* to *XIV kal. Oct.* = $30 - (14 - 9) = 30 - 5 = 25$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-five/-six days. Greek or Roman.

* M. Aurelius, life (71.34.5): 22 days. 26 April to 17 March = *VI kal. Mai.* to *XVI kal. Apr.* = $31 - (16 - 6) = 31 - 10 = 21$. A Greek calculation would yield nineteen/twenty days. Roman only.²

3. Calculation Method 3

This involves a sequence of dates in which the first figure is a nones or ides date and the second is a kalends date. The calculation begins by compensating for the inclusive reckoning of Roman dates, as we saw in the introduction to Chapter 5: one is subtracted from the figure associated with the nones/ides, unless it is the nones/ides itself, then nothing is subtracted; and two is subtracted from the kalends date, unless it is the kalends itself, then one is added, since the end of the month has been exceeded by one day. The result of the nones/ides subtraction is then subtracted from

2 The year of Marcus' death was a leap year, but it seems unlikely that Dio (or his source) knew that or would have compensated for it even if he had.

whatever day of the month the nones/ides is, 7 and 15 in March, May, July, and October, and 5 and 13 in the other months. The nones/ides result and the kalends result are then subtracted from (or added to, for a positive kalends figure) either thirty or thirty-one, depending on the month. The result is a normal count.

3.1. *Data*

Augustus, reign: see Method 5.1, below.

Vitellius, reign: see § 9.4, below.

Vespasian, interval since Nero's death (66.17.4): 22 days. 9 June to 1 July = V id. Iun. to kal. Iul. = $30 - (13 - [5 - 1]) + 1 = 30 - 9 + 1 = 30 - 8 = 22$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-two/three days. Greek or Roman.

Domitian, reign (67.18.2): 5 days. 13 September to 18 September = id. Sept. to XIII kal. Oct. = $(30 - 13 - [14 - 2]) = 30 - 13 - 12 = 30 - 25 = 5$. A Greek calculation would yield five/six days. Greek or Roman.

Nerva, age at accession (68.4.2): 10 days. 8 November to 18 September = VI id. Nov. to XIII kal. Oct. = $(30 - (13 - [6 - 1]) - [14 - 2]) = 30 - 8 - 12 = 30 - 20 = 10$. A Greek calculation would yield ten/eleven days. Greek or Roman.

3.2. *Exception (i. e. an inclusive result)*

M. Aurelius, reign (71.34.5): 11 days. 7 March to 17 March = non. Mar. to XVI kal. Apr. = $31 - 7 - (16 - 2) = 31 - 7 - 14 = 31 - 21 = 10$. A Greek calculation would yield ten/eleven days. Greek or Roman.

3.3. *Extrapolation*

Galba, reign (64.6.5²): 13 days. Since we know that Galba's reign ended on 15 January/XVIII kal. Feb. (see Chapter 5, § 41, above), the date of his accession can be extrapolated: $13 = (31 - [18 - 2]) - x$, $13 = 15 - x$, $15 - 13 = x$, $x = 2$ April. The result is normal, as we would expect for this method. See Murison 1999: 53 (who misunderstands Snyder and seriously muddies the waters by counting backwards) and Holzapfel 1912: 490–1.

4. Calculation Method 4.

This involves a sequence of dates in which the first figure is a kalends date and the second is a nones/ides/kalends date later in the month or in the following month. This is essentially the reverse of the method set out in Method 3: once the numbers associated with the nones, ides, and kalends have been corrected for inclusive reckoning, the results are simply added together, not subtracted from the total number of days in the month. The result is a normal count.

However, as can be seen, there is a larger number of variant results for this type of calculation than there is for any other, by which I mean that Dio reports twice as

many inclusive as normal results for this type of calculation. I cannot explain the discrepancy between the calculations and Dio's figures, but since these unusual results are confined to this specific method, there must have been some error or particular variation in the way Dio (or his source) performed this calculation that I have not been able to discover.

4.1. *Data (inclusive)*

Claudius, life (60.34.3): 13 days. 1 August to 13 October = kal. Aug. to III id. Oct. = $(1 - 2) + (15 - [3 - 1]) = -1 + 13 = 12$. A Greek calculation would yield twelve/thirteen days. Greek or Roman.

Vespasian, reign: see § 5.1, below.

Titus, reign (66.18.4): 20 days. 24 June to 13 September = VIII kal. Iul. to id. Sept. = $(8 - 2) + (13) = 19$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty/twenty-one days. Greek normal or Roman inclusive. Since so many of these Method 4 calculations are inclusive, and since there is no other evidence for a use of Greek dates, this is likely a Roman inclusive result.

Trajan, reign (68.33.3): 15 days. 28 January to 11 August³ = V kal. Feb. to III id. Aug. = $(5 - 2) + (13 - [3 - 1]) = 3 + 11 = 14$. A Greek calculation would yield fourteen/fifteen days. Greek or Roman.

Hadrian, life: see § 9.6 below.

4.2. *Exceptions (i. e. normal results)*

Claudius, reign (60.34.3): 20 days. 24 January to 13 October = VIII kal. Feb. to III id. Oct. = $(9 - 2) + (15 - [3 - 1]) = 7 + 13 = 20$. A Greek calculation would yield nineteen/twenty days. Greek inclusive or Roman normal. The same result achieved by an inclusive Greek count can be found in Josephus (*Jewish War* 2.248 and *Jewish Antiquities* 20.148). The difference arises because a count from a thirty-one day month (January) is transposed onto a thirty-day month (September).

Nero, life: see § 9.2, below.

Septimius Severus, reign (76.17.4): 3 days. 1 June to 4 February = kal. Iun. to pr. non. Feb. = $(1 - 2) + 5 - [2 - 1] = -1 + 4 = 3$. A Greek calculation would yield three/four days. Greek or Roman.

5. Calculation Method 5

This method produces a reverse count from the end of the month, using the formula 'X months lacking Y days'. The problem is that in all but two instances, this calculation method produces exclusive results (one of which is even one less than an exclusive count, which is impossible), a type of result that appears nowhere else in Dio's calculations (or for that matter, as we can now say from the results of Chapter

3 This counts to the accession of Hadrian, not to Trajan's death.

5, in any other ancient historian's calculations for these types of figures). Snyder believed that Dio assumed that every anniversary was in fact the day before the exact date a year later, which is illogical since there is no trace of this interpretation in the figures we have examined in Methods 1 to 4, and it does not appear in the calculation for Macrinus, which provides the final example of this type of dating method in the history (1940a: 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54–5).

There is only one way to explain the appearance of these figures. All durations but that for Macrinus were originally calculated in the usual fashion and reported as years, months, and days. After undertaking a reverse count for Macrinus because it was so simple ($6 - 3 = 3$, see below) Dio then picked a selection of earlier figures and stated them as reverse counts as well. Since by this point he had only the numbers in his text and not the dates themselves, he just subtracted each figure from a standard month of thirty days. We cannot know why he did this – one suspects it was to provide some variety to his otherwise monotonous reporting – but as can be seen, this interpretation works perfectly for every example, even that of Nero's reign, which did not fit Snyder's hypothesis (1940a: 47).

This method was also employed by Epiphanius, who renders Claudius' thirteen years, one month, and twenty-eight days (*Lib. gen.* 381) as 'thirteen years and two months lacking two days' (*De mens. et pond.* lines 350–1). A similar method can be seen in Chapter 5 in the many instances where long day figures are converted into month and day figures (and vice versa) by employing a standard thirty-day month. Thus eighty days is rendered as two months ($= 2 \times 30$ days) and ten days, and ninety days is three months. This system works because one is never talking about 'real' months, simply the notional or abstract idea of what a month is, i.e. a block of thirty days.

5.1. Data

Augustus, reign (56.30.5): lacking thirteen days. 2 September to 19 August = IV non. Sept. to XIV kal. Sept. A calculation following Method 3 would result in a normal figure of seventeen days ($31 - (5 - [4 - 1]) - (14 - 2) = 31 - 2 - 12 = 31 - 13 - 14 = 17$) and $30 - 17 = 13$. A Greek calculation would yield seventeen/eighteen days. Greek or Roman.

Caligula, age at accession (59.6.2): lacking four days. 31 August to 26 March = pr. kal. Sept. to VII kal. Apr. A calculation following Method 2 would result in a normal figure of twenty-six days ($31 - [7 - 2] = 31 - 5 = 26$) and $30 - 26 = 4$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-six/seven days. Greek or Roman.

Nero, reign (63.29.3): lacking two days. 13 October to 9 June = III id. Oct. to V id. Iun. A calculation following Method 2 would result in a normal figure of twenty-eight days ($30 - (5 - 3) = 30 - 2 = 28$) and $30 - 28 = 2$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-seven/eight days. Greek inclusive or Roman normal.

Vitellius, reign: see § 9.4, below.

Vespasian, reign (66.17.3): lacking six days. 1 July to 24 June = kal. Iul. to VIII kal. Iul. A calculation based on Method 4, above, produces a normal result of 23: $(1 - 2) + (30 - [8 - 2]) = -1 + 30 - 6 = 30 - 7 = 23$. Most results using Method 4,

however, are inclusive, which would bump this figure to twenty-four and $30 - 24 = 6$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-three/four days. Greek or Roman. As noted above, this is counted to the accession of Titus, not Vespasian's death.

Pertinax, life (73.10.3): lacking three days. 1 August to 28 Mar. = kal. Aug. to V kal. Apr. A calculation based on Method 2 produces a normal result of twenty-seven days ($31 - [5 - 1] = 31 - 4 = 27$) and $30 - 27 = 3$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty-seven/eight days. Greek or Roman.

5.2. *Exception*

Macrinus, reign (78.41.4): lacking three days. This is the sole reverse calculation that is correct, and was therefore probably the result of an actual calculation with the original dates: 11 April to 8 June = III id. Apr. to VI id. Iun = $6 - 3 = 3$. It was no doubt this example, calculated correctly from the easy subtraction of ides dates, that prompted Dio to go back and alter some of his earlier calculations. A Greek calculation would yield three/four days. Greek or Roman.

5.3. *Extrapolation*

Otho, life (64.15.2¹): lacking eleven days, counted from 28 April (Suetonius, *Otho* 2.1) = IIII kal. Mai. There is no explicit source for Otho's death, but extrapolation from other sources indicates that Otho died on 16 April (see Chapter 5, § 42). Calculation Method 2 with the dates IIII kal. Mai. and XVI kal. Mai. (16 April) yields $30 - [16 - 4] = 30 - 12 = 18$, which is a normal result. However, since substituting the required eleven days gives us a result of 19 not 18 ($30 - 11 = 19$), Dio must be counting inclusively here. See Murison 1999: 70–1. A Greek calculation would yield eighteen/nineteen days. Greek or Roman.

6. Calculation Method 6

This involves a figure where the number of days is longer than one month. Calculating the result is just a matter of adding up the days, once the inclusive reckoning of the dates has been compensated for at the beginning and end. The result is a normal count.

6.1. *Data*

Otho, reign: see § 9.3, below.

Vitellius, life: see § 9.4, below.

Pertinax, reign (73.10.3): eighty-seven days. 31 December to 28 March = pr. kal. Ian.⁴ to V kal. Apr. = $(2 - 2) + 31 + 28 + (31 - [5 - 2]) = 0 + 31 + 28 + 28 = 87$. There is no difference between Greek and Roman here. Greek or Roman.

4 Note that Snyder has the wrong date in his analysis (1940a: 51).

6.2. *Extrapolation*

Didius Julianus, reign (73.17.5): sixty-six days. This is counted from 28 March/*V kal. Apr.* (see Chapter 5, § 55). Sixty-six days calculated normally gives a date of 2 June ($[5 - 2] + 30 + 31 + 2 = 66$), but since we know that Septimius Severus' reign was calculated from 1 June (see Method 4.1, above, which is calculated normally), this count must be inclusive. There is no difference between Greek and Roman here.

7. Calculation Method 7

This involves a count between a nones date and an ides date. The numbers of the dates are corrected for the inclusive count and then subtracted from 13 (the ides date) and 5 (the nones date). The nones result is then subtracted from the ides result. There is only one example. The result is normal.

7.1. *Data*

Caracalla, reign and life (78.6.5): four days (reign corrected from the manuscripts' 'two days' from internal data, although the 'two' may be what Dio originally wrote even though it is wrong: see Chapter 5, § 58). 4 April/4 February and 8 April = *pr. non. Apr./Feb. to VI id. Apr.* = $(13 - [6 - 1]) - (5 - [2 - 1]) = (13 - 5) - (5 - 1) = 8 - 4 = 4$. A Greek calculation would yield four/five days. Greek or Roman.

8. Calculation Method 8

This involves a sequence of dates in which the first figure is an ides date and the second is a nones date. The method is the reverse of Method 7, and so once we have obtained the final ides and nones results (having subtracted one from both and having subtracted each from thirteen and five, respectively), we must subtract the ides result from thirty-one (the number of days in January, since we are counting from 11 January to 4 February) and add that to the nones result. There is only one example. The result is normal.

8.1. *Data*

Septimius Severus, life (76.17.4): twenty-five days. 11 April to 4 February = *III id. Apr. to pr. non. Feb.* = $(31 - [13 - (3 - 1)]) + (5 - [2 - 1]) = (31 - 11) + 4 = 20 + 4 = 24$ (normal). The count must therefore be inclusive (= 25). A Greek calculation would yield twenty-four/five days. Greek or Roman.

9. Outliers

9.1. x Caligula, reign (59.30.1): twenty-eight days. 26 March to 24 January = VII kal. Apr. to VIII kal. Feb.

Dio's figure of twenty-eight days (corroborated by Xiphilinus, Zonaras, and John of Antioch) is not consistent with Calculation Method 2, as we would expect it to be: $31 - (9 - 7) = 31 - 2 = 29$ (normal)/30 (inclusive). A Greek calculation would yield the same results. The result is exclusive, a type of count that Dio never uses. Snyder could not explain this calculation convincingly (1940a: 46).

Although Xiphilinus, Zonaras, and John of Antioch all report twenty-eight days, the earliest witness to Dio's text here is Epiphanius, who was writing his *De mensuris et ponderibus* around 392. He reports the number as twenty-nine (Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* 350), which is a normal result. Because Epiphanius' duration relies on Dio's unique and incorrect date for Tiberius' death/Caligula's accession, it must come from Dio. We must therefore be dealing with a rare (and unusual) scribal error here, 'KH' for 'KΘ', in a manuscript tradition of Dio's history that was available to the later historians. On this evidence, the text of Dio should be emended to follow Epiphanius. The result is normal, Greek and Roman.

9.2. x Nero, life (63.29.3): 20 days. 15 December to 9 June = XVIII kal. Ian. to V id. Iun.

Dio's figure of twenty days will not work with any method of calculation. It is five/six days (normal/inclusive) short of the correct figure according to Method 4 – $(18 - 2) + (13 - [5 - 1]) = 16 + 9 = 25$ – and is so incorrect that we must be dealing with corruption, not just a variant in the calculation method. The only candidate for corruption is the date of Nero's birth, since Dio's count of the period between Nero's death and Vespasian's accession is counted accurately from 9 June (66.17.4), and the error is five or six days, which cannot be compensated for through normal scribal corruption in his death date.

The Latin date for Nero's birth is *XVIII kal. Ian.* If the -V- had dropped out through scribal error in one of Dio's sources, resulting in *XIII kal. Ian.* (20 December), the result would be twenty, according to Method 4: $(13 - 2) + (13 - [5 - 1]) = 11 + 9 = 20$. This would be an unusual normal result for Method 4, but note that Claudius' calculation (immediately preceding) is also Method 4 and it is normal as well. On the other hand, the error could also be a matter of scribal omission in an early manuscript of Dio, 'K' for 'KE' (or even 'Kς'). This is perhaps the easiest solution, but there is no other evidence for such an error in the text of Dio, which makes it less likely.

Without further evidence, it is best to remain with the first hypothesis, since it is supported by the parallel of the loss of a number from the Latin date of Tiberius' death. The result is normal, Greek and Latin.

9.3. x Otho, reign (64.15.2¹): ninety days. 15 January to 16 April = XVIII kal. Feb. to XVI kal. Mai.

The figure as it stands in Dio will not work (like Method 6 it is a simple count; there is no calculation), and since both dates have been confirmed from Dio's other calculations, we know that they are not erroneous. According to Method 6, the result should be ninety-one days ($[18 - 2] + 28 + 31 + [30 - (16 - 2)] = 16 + 28 + 31 + 16 = 91$). Method 1 would render three months and two days, which is ninety-two days (inclusive), so that cannot be the method employed either. Furthermore, ninety-one, ninety-two, and ninety-five days are correctly attested by other sources (see Chapter 5, § 42), the first two figures derived by counting to Otho's death normally and inclusively, the other to Vitellius' accession inclusively. The *Breviarium* reports the same mistaken total, which probably derives indirectly Dio's source (as does the previous duration for Galba). This rules out error on the part of Dio or of later scribes. From a Method 6 calculation, we would expect that the count would yield a normal result, and so a -I (Latin) or '-A' (Greek) may have been lost from Dio's source. On the other hand, a number of historians give Otho a reign of a round three months (Plutarch, Eusebius and his followers, the *Epit. de caes.*, and Malalas). When converted into days, that becomes an even ninety days, and this simple conversion, from ninety-one days to a round three months and then back to ninety days, could be the source of this erroneous ninety days in Dio and the *Breviarium*. As was the case with Nero above, this analysis has provided the parameters for us to realize that an error, not a variant calculation method, must be involved, but unfortunately we cannot be certain exactly what sort of error it must be. See Holzapfel 1913: 289–95 and Murison 1999: 70–1. The result is Greek and Roman.

9.4. x Vitellius, life (65.22.1): 89 days. 24 September to 20 December = VIII kal. Oct. to XIII kal. Ian.

x Vitellius, reign (65.22.1): lacking ten days. 2 January to 20 December = IIII non. Ian. to XIII kal. Ian.

As Snyder notes (1940a:48), the figures Dio gives for Vitellius' life and reign simply do not follow any calculation for the known dates.

Life = $(8 - 2) + 31 + 30 + (31 - [13 - 2]) = 6 + 31 + 30 + (31 - 11) = 87$ (Method 6, normal).

Reign: $31 - (5 - [4 - 1]) + (13 - 2) = 31 - 2 - 11 = 18$, and then $30 - 18 = 12$ (Methods 3 and 5, normal).

Dio's figures for both Vitellius' life and his reign are erroneous; one result is two days too low, the other is two days too high. These facts alone prove that Dio had an incorrect date, and this can be demonstrated by substituting the incorrect 22 December (*XI kal. Ian.*) for the correct 20 December (*XIII kal. Ian.*), the date of his death, which yields the correct numbers for both calculations:

Life: 89 days. VIII kal. Oct. to XI kal. Ian. = $(8 - 2) + 31 + 30 + (31 - [11 - 2]) = 6 + 31 + 30 + 22 = 89$. A Greek calculation yields the same result. Greek or Roman.

Reign: lacking ten days. IIII non. Ian. to XI kal. Ian. = $31 - (5 - [4 - 1]) + (11 - 2) = 31 - 2 - 9 = 20$, and then $30 - 20 = 10$. A Greek calculation would yield twenty/twenty-one days. Greek or Roman.

Dio's source must have lost *-II* from the *XIII*, a not uncommon error. See Murison 1999: 120, who correctly realizes the mathematical solution I present here, but draws the wrong conclusion because he fails to realize that Dio's information could be wrong. See also Holzapfel 1913: 295–304 and 1918: 99–105.

Since Dio calculates Vespasian's reign from his initial proclamation by the army on 1 July, this change in Vitellius' date has no knock-on effect on Vespasian's figures.

9.5. (x) Vespasian, life (66.17.3): 8 days. 17 Nov to 24 June (Titus' *dies imperii*; see Chapter 5, § 44) = XV kal. Dec. to VIII kal. Iul. = $15 - 8 = 7$. A Greek calculation would yield the same seven/eight days. The result is therefore inclusive, both Greek and Roman.

However, all other results for method one are normal and this result is inclusive, which is peculiar. But all is not as it seems with Vespasian's figures. Xiphilinus and Zonaras, the only two witnesses to Dio's text, have eight instead of the correct seven for the number of months (see Boissevain's edition, p. 152 n. 14; Snyder 1940a: 39 n. 3; and Murison 1999: 178), and Xiphilinus omits the number of days altogether.⁵ Everyone accepts Boissevain's emendation of the eight years to seven simply because eight is demonstrably wrong, but it is also probable that whatever prompted the change of seven months to eight months also prompted the change of seven days to eight days (an odd 'Z' to 'H' in Greek). Since everyone accepts the emendation of the months from eight to seven, there is no reason why the same emendation of the days cannot be accepted as well. Suetonius gives Vespasian's regnal duration as a normal sixty-nine years, seven months, and seven days (*Vesp.* 24), which is what we would expect from Dio here following Method 1. I therefore suggest that Dio's original figures were seven months and seven days, but that both figures were corrupted to eight in the same way in a later copy and were therefore originally the result of a normal calculation, like all other Method 1 results. Greek or Roman.

9.6. *x Hadrian, life (69.23.1): 19 days. 24 January to 10 July = VIII kal. Feb. to VI id. Iul.

*x Hadrian, reign (69.23.1): no days. 11 August to 10 July = III id. Aug. to VI id. Iul.

As was the case above with Vitellius, the figures Dio gives for both Hadrian's life and reign do not work for any of the above calculation methods or known dates:

5 It should be noted that for the first century Zonaras used Dio and Xiphilinus, and from the end of the first century just Xiphilinus. Here the loss of the day figures in Xiphilinus shows that Zonaras must be using Dio directly so the error was Dio's, not the epitomator's.

Life: $(9 - 2) + (15 - [6 - 1]) = 7 + (15 - 5) = 7 + 10 = 17$. A Greek count produces sixteen, which is even further off.

Reign: $31 - (6 - 3) = 28$, thus ten months and twenty-eight days.

Snyder says the reign result is inclusive Greek (1940a: 50), but it is erroneous to say that a count is either inclusive or normal when the number of days is zero. The dates would have to be 11 August and 11 July for a result of eleven months even in a Greek calculation. Unfortunately there is no evidence for Dio's figure for the reign of Antoninus Pius (see Snyder 1940a: 50), which would make this problem much easier to gauge. (Unfortunately both Xiphilinus and Zonaras incorrectly give Pius a reign of a round twenty-four years, which cannot be what was in Dio: Dio 71.1.1¹ and 12.1, p. 525.18–19).

The solution for Vitellius points the way to the solution for Hadrian. The fact that Dio's figures for Hadrian's life and reign are both too short indicates that he must have employed a date later than 10 July, since that is the only date both figures share. That cannot be avoided. But because we are missing three days from the life ($31 - 28 = 3$) and two from the reign ($19 - 17 = 2$), Dio's figure for either the reign or the life of Hadrian must also be emended. This yields two hypotheses:

1. If it is the figure for Hadrian's reign that is incorrect, we should assume a date of 13 July, since twenty years and exactly eleven months takes one from 11 August (*III id. Aug.*) 117 to 13 July (*III id. Iul.*) 138. It is interesting to note that this substitution shifts the Roman date from *VI id. Iul.* to *III id. Iul.*, an obvious and simple palaeographical error in a Latin source.

If we then use the emended date of 13 July (*III id. Iul.*) in the calculation for Hadrian's life, it gives a result one day too high, since we have added three days and are only two days short: $(9 - 2) + (15 - [3 - 1]) = 7 + (15 - 2) = 7 + 13 = 20$. We would therefore have to emend Dio's ἡμέρας ἐννεακαίδεκα to ἡμέρας εἴκοσι ('IΘ' to 'K'). This is not a normal sort of palaeographical error in Greek, and it would be best to surmise some sort of calculation error to explain it rather than a corruption of the text.

2. If it is the figure for Hadrian's life that is incorrect, we should assume a date of 11 July. For the life calculation to be correct, we require a day that will render nineteen normally or inclusively. Since this calculation involves method four, we would expect inclusive. A date of 11 July fulfills this requirement: $(9 - 2) + (15 - [5 - 1]) = 7 + (15 - 4) = 7 + 11 = 18$ (inclusive = 19). This also provides a Roman date, *V id. Iul.*, that would explain the corruption with a simple scribal error, *VI* to *V*. A shift to *III id. Iul.* (12 July), which would give us a normal nineteen as a result, would be more difficult to explain palaeographically.

If we use 11 July to calculate the length of Hadrian's reign, we must begin with a method two calculation: *III id. Aug.* to *V id. Iul.* = $31 - (5 - 3) = 31 - 2 = 29$. That produces the figure of ten months and twenty-nine days, which could then have been changed to eleven months lacking one day ($30 - 1 = 29$). In this case, our text would have lost ἡμέρας μᾶς δέοντας.⁶

6 No doubt the phrase was simply missed by Xiphilinus (see previous note for another example). Since it is missing from Xiphilinus, its loss is to be expected in Zonaras (see previous note),

Of the two hypotheses I find the second more generally plausible. That this sort of loss is possible is demonstrated by Xiphilinus, who has accidentally missed δυοῖν ἡμερῶν δέοντας at 63.29.3 and καὶ ἡμέρας ὀκτώ at 66.17.3. Zonaras also frequently omits the day figures in these expressions (e.g. 10.38, p. 429.5 = Dio 56.30.5).

We are therefore faced with two errors here: Dio calculated Hadrian's life and reign to 11 July instead of 10 July, and at some point ἡμέρας μᾶς δέοντας was lost from the figure describing Hadrian's reign, either in the copying of Dio's text or when Xiphilinus epitomized it.

Life: A Greek calculation would yield sixteen/seventeen days, therefore Roman only.

Reign: A Greek calculation would yield 0 days, therefore Roman only.

*

In summary, then, we have the following list of errors and corruptions in Dio's data: incorrect date: Tiberius/Caligula, Nero, Vitellius, and Hadrian; rounded figure taken from another source: Otho; scribal corruption of number: Caligula, Vespasian; and loss of text: Hadrian.

10. Conclusions

A number of conclusions are clear immediately. Dio never used exclusive or Greek calculations. The evidence is consistent with calculations using Roman dates only. However, there is still an eclectic mix of normal and inclusive reckoning as can be seen from the following table.

Table 1: Total Counts According to Calculation Method

	Reign		Age/Life	
Method	Normal	Inclusive	Normal	Inclusive
1	4	0	4	0
2	3	0	4	4
3	4	1	2	0
4	2	3	1	2
6	2	1	1	0
7	1	0	1	0
8	0	0	0	1
TOTALS	16	5	13	7

TOTAL: 29 normal and 12 inclusive

who changes twenty years and eleven months to twenty-one years lacking one month (p. 521.18).

Dio tends to calculate reigns normally by a more than three to one margin, with three of five inclusive results being accounted for by Method 4, while in the age/life figures the normal calculation dominates over the inclusive by just under two to one. The five inclusive reigns are Vespasian, Titus, Trajan (all method four), M. Aurelius, and Didius Julianus. This distribution tells us little about possible reasons for the different method. Inclusive ages/lives are Claudius, Galba, Otho, Domitian, Hadrian, M. Aurelius, and Septimius Severus. Overall there are six in the first century, five in the second, and one in the second/third. It is also interesting to note, first, that there are three pairings in the post-100 inclusive figures (Trajan and Hadrian, M. Aurelius [x 2], and Didius Julianus and Severus), and, second, that between Claudius and Domitian only Nero and Vitellius have lives/ages that are normal results. Strangely, only M. Aurelius has both reign and life figures calculated in the same way.

It seems unlikely that Dio himself would have used two different methods of calculating his figures. If he had made all the calculations himself, I suspect he would have used only the inclusive method, to which being Greek would predispose him. (Cf. Josephus' duration figures, which, as noted above in Chapter 5, are all inclusive). His count of four days between 8 and 11 April (78.11.6), for instance, is inclusive. However, the variation we see could be accounted for if he had obtained many or even most of his figures from other sources that relied on their own various sources, which in turn could have calculated their figures normally or inclusively. My analysis in Chapter 5 shows that normal calculations predominate in the Roman historical tradition, but there is nevertheless much evidence for inclusive calculation throughout the period investigated above. Even a solidly Latin historian with Latin sources, like Eutropius, reveals an interesting variation between normal and inclusive calculations.

But the real problem here is that there is almost no evidence for the uncorrected use of Roman dates in any of the many different sources that have been examined above. Reign lengths appear to have been calculated with Greek dates, or with Roman dates with simple corrections employed to avoid the errors we see in Dio. There is only one obvious example of an uncorrected Roman date calculation in the extant traditions (in § 49 for Hadrian), yet there are seven durations in Dio that result from such calculations: Augustus' life (normal), Tiberius' life (normal), Nerva's reign (normal), Hadrian's life (inclusive) and reign (normal), M. Aurelius' life (inclusive), and Elagabalus' reign (normal). The consistency of the method from Augustus to Elagabalus suggests that these calculations are either all Dio's or are largely drawn from a common source, in spite of the shifts from normal to inclusive calculation. No obvious solution to this dilemma presents itself, except that Dio was inconsistent in his calculation of durations for whatever reason.

The second major conclusion that can be drawn from the above analysis is that Dio's duration figures are indeed very accurate but are nevertheless still susceptible to error. These errors are not such that they shake the confidence we have in Dio's data and thus prevent us from trusting the dates that we derive from these data through extrapolation. Our understanding of the appearance of normal and inclusive days is such that we can have great confidence in the extrapolated dates we

obtain from Dio: Nero's death (9 June), Galba's accession (2 April), Otho's death (16 April), and Didius Julianus' birth (28 January) and the end of his reign (1 June).⁷ Extrapolation has also shown that Dio does not provide a date for Elagabalus' death, but gives only the date of Severus Alexander's *dies imperii*.

7 Kienast gives no date for Galba's accession (p. 102), offers 17 April as an alternative for Otho's death (p. 105), and reports 30 January for Didius Julianus' birth, 1 June for his deposition, and 2 June for his assassination (p. 154).

APPENDIX 2. THE WITNESSES TO THE *KAISERGESCHICHTE*

As explained above in Chapter 4, the *Kaisergeschichte* was a now-lost *breviarium* that was used as a source by Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Jerome, and the authors of the *Historia Augusta* and the *Epitome de caesaribus*, as well as other fourth- and fifth-century authors whom I shall not consider here. The existence of the *KG* is proved by many parallel words, phrases, and sentences; common ordering of ideas; common omissions; and common errors among these texts. Furthermore, there is no evidence from these histories of direct borrowing from one another where these parallels occur. Since these four texts share a common source, we would expect their regnal durations to agree with one another, but as we have seen above, they do not always. This is a perplexing problem, since these epitomators are often portrayed as slavishly following their single source.

The table below reproduces the regnal durations for the emperors down to Jovian (the end of Eutropius) from Aurelius Victor (AV), Eutropius (E), the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (EC) and the *Historia Augusta* (HA). It also includes the figures from Suetonius (S), the major source of the *KG* for the emperors to Domitian, and two additions that Jerome made to Eusebius' text of the *Chronici canones* from the *KG*.

Table 1: Witnesses to the *KG*

years/months/days

x – indefinite figure noted (e. g. 'a few days')

- – less than the figure noted (e. g. -2/0/0 = 'not quite two years', 6/0/-x = six years less a few days)

+ – plus sign

† – beginning or end of text

* – Jerome, *Chronici canones* (additions from the *KG*)

a – as augustus

c – as caesar

	S	AV	E	EC	HA
Augustus	12/0/0 44/0/0	44/0/0	12/0/0 44/0/0 =56/0/0	12/0/0 44/0/0 =56/0/0	
Tiberius	23/0/0	23/0/0	23/0/0	23/0/0	
Caligula	3/10/8	3/x/0	3/10/8	4/0/0	
Claudius	14/0/0	14/0/0	14/0/0	14/0/0	
Nero	-14/0/0	14/0/0	14/0/0	13/0/0	
Galba	0/7/0	0/7/7	0/7/0	0/7/7	
Otho	0/0/95	0/0/85	0/0/95	0/3/0	
Vitellius	0/8/0	0/8/0	0/8/1	0/8/0	
Vespasian		10/0/0	9/0/7	10/0/0	

	S	AV	E	EC	HA
Titus	2/2/20	2/-9/0	2/8/20	2/2/20	
Domitian	15/0/0	15/0/0	15/0/0	15/0/0	
Nerva	†	0/16/0	1/4/8	0/16/10	
Trajan		-20/0/0	19/6/15	20/0/0	†
Hadrian		21/11/0	21/10/29	22/0/0	21/11/0
Antoninus Pius		20/0/0	23/0/0	23/0/0	
Lucius Verus			11/0/0*	11/0/0	11/0/0
Marcus Aurelius		18/0/0	18/0/0	18/0/0	18/0/0
Commodus		13/0/0	12/8/0	13/0/0	
Pertinax		0/0/80	0/0/80	0/0/85	0/2/25
Didius Julianus			0/7/0	0/7/0	0/2/5
Septimius Severus		18/0/0	16/3/0	18/0/0	
Geta		'confestim'	'confestim'		
Caracalla		6/0/0	6/2/0	6/0/0	6/0/0
Macrinus		0/14/0	1/2/0/	0/14/0	0/14/0
Elagabalus		0/30/0	2/8/0	2/8/0	-3/0/0
Severus Alexander		13/0/0	13/0/9	13/0/0	13/0/9
Maximinus		3/0/0	3/0/x	3/0/0	3/0/0
Gordian I					
Gordian II					
Pupienus and Balbinus					1/0/0
Gordian III		6/0/0		6/0/0	6/0/0
Philip I and II		5/0/0	5/0/0	5/0/0	†
Decius		2/0/0	2/0/0	0/30/0	
Gallus and Volusian		2/0/0	-2/0/0	2/0/0	
Aemilian		0/3/0	0/3/0*	0/4/0	†
Valerian		6/0/0		15/0/0	6/0/0 +
Gallienus		9/0/0	9/0/0	7/0/0 + 8/0/0 =15/0/0	9/0/0 =15/0/0
Postumus			10/0/0		
Marius		0/0/2	0/0/2		
Victorinus		2/0/0	2/0/0		
Tetricus		2/0/0			
Claudius Gothicus			-2/0/0	1/9/0	
Quintillus			0/0/17*	0/0/x	0/0/17
Aurelian				5/6/0	-6/0/0
<i>interregnum</i>		0/6/0		0/7/0	0/6/0
Tacitus		0/0/200	0/6/0	0/0/200	0/6/0
Florian		0/1 or 0/2	0/2/20	0/0/60	0/-2/0
Probus		-6/0/0		6/0/0	5/0/0
Carus				2/0/0	
Carinus and Numerian (all three)		2/0/0			
Diocletian		20/0/0		25/0/0	†
Maximian		19/0/0		20/0/0	
Carausius		6/0/0	7/0/0		
Allectus		'breui'	3/0/0		
Constantius		1/0/0a	13/0/0*		
		13/0/0c			
Galerius		5/0/0a			
		13/0/0c			

	S	AV	E	EC	HA
Maxentius		6/0/0			
Maximinus		2/0/0a		4/0/0c	
				3/0/0a	
Licinius		5/?+3/+6/0/0		14/0/0	
Constantine I		32/0/0	31/0/0	30/0/0	
Constantine II		3/0/0			
Constantius			38/0/0	15/0/0c + 24/0/0a =39/0/0	
Constans		13/0/0a	17/0/0	3/0/0c 13/0/0a	
Vetranio		0/-10/0		0/0/x	
Nepotian		0/0/28	0/0/28	0/0/28	
Magnentius		3/0/0	3/7/0	0/42/0	
Gallus				4/0/0	
Silvanus		0/0/28*	0/0/-30	0/0/28	
Julian			7/0/0		
Jovian		†	0/7/0	0/8/0	

COMMENTARY

Caligula: Here only Eutropius reports the exact numbers from the *KG* (from Suetonius). Victor and the Epitomator generalize or round it.

Nero: Victor merely says that Nero reigned as long as Claudius. The number in the *Epitome* looks like a corruption ('XIII' for 'XIII'), since the Epitomator is following Victor here, though it may be a figure from another source that has been truncated.

Galba: We would expect Eutropius to be following the *KG* here since his figure reflects what is in Suetonius, but Victor reports the correct seven days, which was copied by the Epitomator. Did the *KG* have the correct number from another source, which Eutropius simply rounded?

Otho: As noted in the commentary on Otho in Chapter 5, Victor's eighty-five days must be an error, whether misreading or corruption, for ninety-five. The Epitomator's three months is a rounded total from the same figure.

Vitellius: Here we see that it is Eutropius who correctly reports the days, which do not appear in Suetonius. This suggests that the *KG* did report days that were not in Suetonius and that the various witnesses randomly dropped them.

Vespasian: Eutropius provides a quite different, but corrupt (with seven days for seven months), count of Vespasian's reign, which is calculated from 20 December instead of 1 July (see the commentary on Vespasian in Chapter 5 § 44). Victor offers a correctly rounded ten years from 1 July (copied by the Epitomator). Suetonius nowhere notes the length of Vespasian's reign.

Titus: Here both Victor and Eutropius, and hence, one assumes, the *KG*, are referring to the same incorrect duration (eight months instead of two). On the other hand, the *Epitome* is able to report the correct figure, which appears in Suetonius,

the supposed source of the *KG*. One would expect the *Epitome* to be following Victor at this point.

Nerva: As we saw in the commentary on Nerva in Chapter 5, Eutropius and the *Epitome* report two quite different traditions, and it is impossible to know which the *KG* contained. Victor reports a rounded version of one of the two, and his sixteen months has influenced the form of the Epitomator's figures.

Trajan: Eutropius reports the correct figures, while Victor and the *Epitome* both offer overly rounded figures (though Victor does at least temper this figure).

Hadrian: Eutropius' precision (ten months and twenty-nine days) is correct, and Victor then rounds his figure to the month, which is then rounded to the year by the Epitomator, but they all incorrectly report twenty-one years instead of twenty. This error is also found in the *HA*, rounded to the month. This proves a close relationship among the four in spite of the three variant totals. It would seem that Marius Maximus, the common source of the *HA* and the *KG* at this point, is the source of the error.

Antoninus Pius: Victor's figure of twenty years (instead of twenty-three) is probably just a scribal error in the tradition of Victor or his immediate source.

Commodus: Eutropius again offers a precise duration, while the other two offer only a rounded figure.

Pertinax: Victor and Eutropius (from the *KG*, which scholars hypothesize is relying on Marius Maximus here) offer a figure different from that found in the *HA* (directly from Maximus) and the *Epitome* (perhaps also directly from Maximus: Barnes 1976: 262–3). It does look as though there are two variant traditions here, one of eighty days (*KG*) and the other of eighty-five (Maximus). The latter is correct.

Didius Julianus: The *KG* (as witnessed by Eutropius and the *Epitome*) is completely wrong. The *HA*, presumably from Marius Maximus, assumed to be a source of the *KG*, is correct. Since the figure of seven months appears again in Malalas and the *Chron. pasch.*, different sources must be involved.

Septimius Severus: Eutropius is the odd one out with a duration figure that looks more accurate, but in fact is corrupt and too low. Eighteen years, the figure given by Aurelius Victor and the *Epitome*, is rounded from Severus' full reign counted from 1 April (seventeen years and ten months).

Caracalla: Here Eutropius is again the odd one out, being the only one to include a months figure, but this time it is accurate.

Elagabalus: Eutropius and the *Epitome* agree on two years and eight months (thirty-two months); Victor seems to be rounding this figure down to thirty months, while the author of the *HA* seems to have rounded it up to just under three years. Since all the figures seem to revolve around two years and eight months, not the correct three years and ten months, a common source must be involved.

Severus Alexander: Here Victor and the Epitomator both omit the number of days, while Eutropius (via the *KG*) and the *HA* (from Maximus) report the full duration.

Maximinus: Again, Eutropius has a days figure that the other sources do not (in fact, he is the only source, Greek or Latin, the *Breviarium* excepted, to specifically

mention a number of days at all), but he is uncharacteristically vague about their number. This is the last emperor, with the exception of Florian (see below), for whom Eutropius offers a duration more detailed than the other witnesses.

Decius: The *Epitome* reports a duration longer than either Eutropius or Victor (two years and six months vs. two years) and now begins to show a distinct divergence from the evidence of Victor and Eutropius (= the *KG*) that continues to the end of the text. This is a result of the use of a Greek source or sources.

Aemilian: The *KG* had three months, while the *Epitome* has four.

Valerian and Gallienus: It seems clear enough that the *KG* assigned Valerian and Gallienus six years and Gallienus alone nine, for a total of fifteen. The *Epitome* must therefore have derived its variant figures (seven years for Gallienus with his father, and eight years for Gallienus alone, for a total of fifteen years) from one of its Greek sources and mistakenly assigned the same figure of fifteen to Valerian, instead of the expected seven.

Claudius: The *Epitome*'s one year and nine months, which otherwise is found only in Eusebius and the later texts that rely on it, almost certainly derives from a Greek source. Eutropius offers only a rounded 'less than two years'.

Aurelian: Strangely, neither Victor nor Eutropius offers a regnal length for Aurelian; perhaps it was missing from the *KG*. The *Epitome* again mirrors the duration in Eusebius. The *HA* probably offers a rounded figure from a Greek source.

Interregnum: The figure of seven months in the *Epitome* must be an error for six, since the *interregnum* is the invention of Victor (see Watson 1999: 109–16) and is otherwise only mentioned in the *Epitome* and the *HA*, both of which used Victor as a source here.

Tacitus: Here again we get a peculiar split, with Victor and the *Epitome* agreeing on two hundred days (= six months and twenty days), the *HA* offering a round six months, and Eutropius saying Tacitus died 'within the sixth month', which I assume is essentially the same figure as that of the *HA*. Two hundred days, however, is closer to seven months than six, so six months is an odd rounding, and it would be strange for both Eutropius and the *HA* to truncate the number in the same way. The *Epitome* may be relying on Victor, as we saw for the *interregnum*.

Florian: Here every source provides a different duration, although Victor (second option), the *Epitome*, and the *HA* can be seen as presenting essentially the same figure (two months). Eutropius' eighty days is the closest to the correct eighty-eight days, which is three months. All four are therefore incorrect.

Probus: Again Victor and the *Epitome* roughly agree, this time it is the *HA* that differs, though it may just be a scribal error. Eutropius says nothing.

Remainder: From this point, there is either insufficient evidence to determine the text of the *KG*, or the evidence is simply too contradictory. The evidence for Constantine is a particularly good example of this confusion, with the three sources offering thirty, thirty-one, and thirty-two years. In this way the witnesses to the *KG* mirror the chronologically confused historical tradition for the late third and early fourth century that we find in all other literary sources. Jerome's error of 'XVI' for the 'XIII' of the *KG* (hence the asterisk above) is explained above in Chapter 5 § 80.

* * *

The evidence presented above is surprisingly convoluted, but there are four quite different possible explanations for what is happening in the data presented above, as well as a hypothetical fifth explanation that could also explain many of the instances of variation.

The first possibility is that the author of the *KG* or his source did not simply repeat the figures that appeared in Suetonius, but instead employed alternative durations, even for those emperors whose durations appeared in Suetonius. Indeed, his chief source for the period seems to have added material to the historical account that was found in Suetonius, and so it is referred to as ‘Suetonius auctus’ (Barnes 1976: 261–2), and such alternative figures may derive from this source.

Second, it may be that some of or all these compilers did not follow the *KG* as slavishly as is usually thought, at least as far as regnal durations were concerned, and employed an additional regnal list or lists. As we have seen above, there must have been many in circulation at the time. This must certainly be the explanation for the third-century variants in the *Epitome*, for which analysis shows the frequent use of an alternative Greek source from the reign of at least Gordian II, who did not appear in the *KG* (see Barnes 1976: 263–5).

Third, there is the possibility of scribal error, in the sources, in the writing of the original texts, or in early apographs, as must certainly be the case for the duration of the interregnum in the *Epitome*, which must have been copied from Victor, and for the duration of Nepotian’s reign in Victor.

Fourth, in many of the cases listed above, some witnesses to the *KG* copied its figures in full, while others reproduced only rounded or truncated versions, although none seems to have taken such decisions consistently. The reasons why one author would copy one duration in full and alter another cannot now be determined. We can see the same situation with Zonaras and Xiphilinus and their inconsistent truncation of the figures in Dio (see Appendix 1). This makes it even more difficult than it might otherwise be to identify sources.

Finally, I have hypothesized that there were different recensions of the *KG* in circulation in the fourth century (Burgess 2005: 188–9), some treated as strict copies of the original, others modified and ‘improved’ by other would-be historians, others completely rewritten, and so it may be that these variant recensions had variant durations, probably through willful substitution from other lists (seen at the time as corrections or improvements). In fact, it may indeed have been the case that what we tend to think of as a specific text of the *KG* really developed into more of a tradition as the fourth century progressed. If the *KG* was used by Victor, Festus, Eutropius, Jerome, Ammianus Marcellinus, Polemius Silvius, and the authors of the *Epitome de caesaribus* and the *HA* – namely every early surviving account of the third century in Latin from the fourth century, with the exception of the *Breviarium* – it must also have been used by many other authors that no longer survive, many of them, like Eutropius and to a much lesser degree Jerome, simply plagiarizing what they found and passing it off under their own names (this may explain the identity of Eusebius Nanneticus; see Burgess 1993: 495–9 and 2005: 188–9). Any one of those lost texts could have served as a source for any one of the surviving

witnesses. This would explain not only the general similarities that we see in the texts, but also all the variations in the durations. Other changes made to individual texts in the tradition – additions, deletions, and rewriting – would not be so obvious to us now as these changes to the numbers. The full extent to which this may have been the case can now no longer be determined, but it should be retained as a working hypothesis.

My feeling is that all five of these explanations are involved to one extent or another in these puzzling variants, which simply cannot be explained by assuming that these authors used the *KG* alone in a ‘cut and paste’ (or ‘cut, rewrite, and paste’) fashion. We shall see further evidence to support this more ‘eclectic’ approach to these authors’ use of the *KG* in Appendix 4 with respect to the death-places of the emperors, another type of historical data that could be obtained from readily available short lists.

As is often the case with *Quellenforschung*, matters are more complicated than they first appear.

APPENDIX 3. CRITICAL EDITION AND TRANSLATION OF THE *BREVIARIUM VINDOBONENSE*

The following edition is based on a fresh look at the three manuscripts and a number of approaches that make it different in some ways from previous editions. First of all, I have kept the numbers and the spelling of the names as they appear in the manuscript. This results in readings that we know are incorrect, but we have seen above that such variants can be extremely useful in tracking traditions and establishing textual relationships, so they should be kept even though they look peculiar.¹ The translation provides the correct forms of the names, so no confusion should rise. Other errors have, however, been corrected.² I have not bothered to report the readings of any edition earlier than Mommsen 1850.

Second, I have included the rubricated markers in the first section indicating the Trojan and Rutulian wars, which previous editors removed as later marginal comments. It seems to me highly unlikely that such secondary notes would have been incorporated into the text as rubricated headings. It is more likely that these were originally rubricated markers intended to highlight for readers the dates of two important early wars. Their purpose and positions were then confused in subsequent copying of the manuscript, and they ended up being placed just before and just after the entry on Latinus, instead of marking events within that entry. As well as retaining text omitted by previous editors, I have added text where I think it has been lost, particularly in the list of Alban kings. My supplements for the latter are based on the patterns seen in the rest of the text. I also believe that each king had his own description at one point, like the earlier and later kings, and that in each case it was their removal that caused the loss of the rest of the entry. Unfortunately, we have no means now of recovering those losses.

Third, I have expanded all the abbreviations in the manuscript. For some reason Mommsen and Frick keep the manuscript abbreviations of words such as ‘regnauit’, ‘imperauit’, ‘annos’, ‘menses’, ‘dies’, ‘imperante’, and ‘congiarium dedit’. The only

1 See Chapter 5 n. 3 for an example of the erroneous ‘correction’ of such details. I *have* corrected declensions, however, as in ‘Oli’ for ‘Olis’ and ‘Curibus’ for ‘Curis’ (§§ 29, 44, 45).

2 I should point out that in late Latin the ablative commonly tends to be substituted for the accusative of extent of time, particularly for years, so even in sequences of years, months, and days one can find the years in the ablative, but the months and days in the accusative (this can be found in the *Breviarium* and on tombstones, for example). As a result, I have left all such ablatives as they appear in the manuscript and expand the abbreviations (‘ann.’, ‘m.’, ‘d.’) according to the context provided by the unabbreviated forms. Similar confusion can be found both in the use of the ablative for the locative – though the locative is always used for *Roma* – and in the proper use of the locative, which leads the use of the locative or the bare ablative in the place of *in* + ablative (which does appear correctly in §§ 70, 79 and 80, and incorrectly in 68). These have not been corrected either, since they are contemporary aspects of Latin grammar that can be found elsewhere.

words I have left abbreviated are ‘kl. Mai.’ in § 24, since that is still the usual way we write and use such forms in Latin.

Any changes from the readings of the manuscripts that are unattributed in the *apparatus* belong to the editorial tradition, and any changes from the readings of the manuscripts and previous editions that are unattributed are mine.

I have tried to explain as well as translate the text, and so I have included additions to the text that are marked by brace brackets.

SIGLA

Codices

- V Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3416, c. 1495
 S St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 878, saec. IX^{2/4}
 C Cesena, Istituzione Biblioteca Malatestiana S.XXI.5, saec. IX^{1/3} (hoc additamentum saec. X–XI)

Editores

- Mom¹ Mommsen 1850: 644–8
 Mom Mommsen 1892: 143–8 (et sine siglo Mom¹ = Mom¹ + Mom)
 Frick Frick 1892: 111–22
 VetZ Valentini and Zucchetti 1940: 269–81

Auctores (uide appendicem quartam)

- Cedr. Cedreni breuiarium
Descr. cons. *Descriptio consulum*
 Eutr. Eutropii breuiarium
 Hier. Hieronymi *Chronici canones*
Lib. de uir. illustr. *Liber de uiris illustribus*

Origo gentis Romanorum ex quo primum in Italia regnare coeperunt (1)

Picus Saturni filius regnavit agro Laurentino usque ad eum locum ubi nunc Roma est annis XXXVIII. Eo tempore ibi nec oppida nec uici erant, sed passim habitauerunt. (2)

Faunus Pici filius eisdem locis regnavit annis XLIII. Eo tempore Hercules, cum ab Hispania reuerteretur, aram quae est Romae ad forum boarium posuit et dedicavit, eo quod Cacus filium Vulcani ibi in spelunca sua occiderat. (3)

Latinus eisdem locis regnavit <annis XXXVI>. Hic ex suo nomine ciues suos Latinos appellavit. Hoc regnante Troia capta est, unde Aeneas Veneris et Anchisae filius venit **Bellum cum Troianis** (4) et se cum Latino iunxit unaque bellum gesserunt aduersus Rutulos. Eo proelio Latinus occisus est et regnum eius penes **Bellum cum Rutulis** (6) Aeneam remansit. (5)

Aeneas oppidum condidit Lauinium ibique regnavit annis tribus. (7)

Ascanius Aeneae filius regnavit annis XXXVI. Albam Longam condidit. (8)

Reges Albani (9)

Posthumus Siluius Aeneae nepos regnavit annis XXXVII. Ab hoc postea prognati Albae regnauerunt ac Silii sunt cognominati. (10)

Eneas Siluius regnavit annos XXXI. (11)

Latinus <regnavit annos> LI. (12)

Alba <regnavit annos> XXVIII. (13)

Appius <regnavit annos> XLI. (14)

Capys <regnavit annos> XXVIII. (15)

Campeius <regnavit annos> XXI. (16)

Titus <regnavit annos> VIII. (17)

Agrippa <regnavit annos> LI. (18)

<**Remulus** regnavit annos XIX.> (18a)

Auentinus <regnavit annos> XXXVIII. (19)

Procas <regnavit annos> VIII. (20)

Amulius <regnavit annos> LI. (21)

Remus Siluius regnavit <annos> XVII. Eum Romulus interfecit. (22)

1 **Item origo gentis Romanorum** / Ex quo primum in Italia regnare ceperunt. picus V origo VetZ : Item origo V Mom Frick ceperunt Frick 2 Picus non rubr. V laurentine V opida V Frick 3 ara V Frick Rome V Frick occideret V 4 **Bellum cum Troianis** post occiderat tamquam titulus in una linea V : om. edd ('eine Marginalglosse', Mom¹; 'fuit in margine archetypi', Mom; 'glossa marginale', VetZ) 5 Latinus V isdem V edd annis XXXVI add. Mom¹ : lacuna edd : nulla lacuna V exsuo V et Troia V Frick et se] esse V praelio Mom¹ Frick eius om. Frick paenus ineam V paenes Frick 6 **Bellum** Aeneas oppidum Rutulis condidit V : Bellum et Rutulis om. edd (uide § 4) 9 et reges Albani V Frick 10 Postumus Mom VetZ siluius non rubr. V aeneae V prognati postea Mom Frick nepus V^a 11 Aeneas Mom VetZ 12–22 Latinus ... Remus Siluius nomina non rubr. V 12–21 regnavit annos om. V edd 12 XI VetZ 18a om. V edd 19 Auentinus Mom 21 Amulius Mom VetZ : et milius V : Etmilius Frick 22 annos om. V edd

The Origin of the Roman People from the Time They First Began to Rule in Italy (1)

Picus, the son of Saturn, ruled for thirty-eight years in the Laurentian territory as far as the place where Rome is now. At that time there were neither towns nor villages there, but {people} lived scattered here and there. (2)

Faunus, the son of Picus, ruled in the same area for forty-four years. At that time, when Hercules was returning from Spain, he set up and dedicated the altar that is in Rome near the Forum Boarium, because he had there killed Cacus, the son of Vulcan, in his cave. (3)

Latinus ruled in the same area <for thirty-six years>. He called his citizens 'Latins' from his own name. During his reign Troy was captured, whence Aeneas, the son of Venus and Anchises, came and allied himself with Latinus, and they fought a war together against the Rutuli. Latinus was killed in that battle and his kingdom remained under Aeneas' control. (5)

The Trojan War (4)

The Rutulian War (6)

Aeneas founded the town of Lavinium and ruled there for three years. (7)

Ascanius, the son of Aeneas, ruled for thirty-six years. He founded Alba Longa. (8)

The Alban Kings (9)

Postumus Silvius, the grandson of Aeneas, ruled for thirty-seven years. His descendants afterwards ruled in Alba and bore the name Silvius. (10)

Aeneas Silvius ruled for thirty-one years. (11)

Latinus <ruled for> fifty-one <years>. (12)

Alba <ruled for> twenty-eight <years>. (13)

Appius <ruled for> forty-one <years>. (14)

Capys <ruled for> twenty-eight <years>. (15)

Calpetus <ruled for> twenty-one <years>. (16)

Titus <ruled for> eight <years>. (17)

Agrippa <ruled for> fifty-one <years>. (18)

<**Remulus** ruled for nineteen years>. (18a)

Aventinus <ruled for> thirty-eight <years>. (19)

Procas <ruled for> eight <years>. (20)

Amulius <ruled for> fifty-one <years>. (21)

Remus Silvius ruled for seventeen <years>. Romulus killed him. (22)

Reges Romanorum numero VIII (23)

Romulus Martis et Iliae filius regnavit annos XXXVIII. Urbem Romam condidit XI kl. Mai., qui dies appellatur Parilia. Hic X menses in anno constituit a Martio in Decembrem. ∞ iuvenes de plebe Romana legit quos milites appellavit et centum seniores quos senatores dixit. Congiarium dedit congium uini inter homines XII. Hic cum natat ad paludem caprae subito nusquam comparuit. In numerum deorum relatus deus Quirinus appellatus est. (24)

Titus Tatius dux Sabinorum una cum Romulo regnavit annos quinque. Hic Tarpeiam uirginem Vestalem uiuam armis defodit, eo quod secreta Romuli ei propalare noluisset. (25)

Numa Pompilius regnavit annos XVI. Pontifices, uirgines Vestae instituit. Hic duos menses ad X menses Romuli instituit, Ianuarius diis superis, Februarium diis inferis. Hic prior hominibus adinuenit grabata mensas sellas candelabra. Congiarium dedit scortinos asses et militibus donatium aere incisum dipondium semis. (26)

Tullius Hostilius regnavit annos XXII. Hic prior censum egit, edictoquo suo cauit ut quicumque temporibus ipsius falsum fecisset, daret pro capite suo dimidium uerbicem. (27)

Mancius Philippus regnavit annos XXXIII. Congiarium dedit assem semis et militibus donatium dipondium semis. Ostiam coloniam condidit. (28)

L. Tarquinius Priscus regnavit annos XXVIII. Hic cum fundamenta Capitolii caualet inuenit caput humanum litteris Tuscis scriptum, caput Oli regis, unde hodieque Capitolium appellatur. Hic prior Romanis duo paria gladiatorum edidit quae comparauit per annos XXVII. (29)

Seruius Tullius serua natus regnavit annos XXV. Hic uotum fecit ut quotquot annos regnasset, tot ostia ad frumentum publicum constitueret. (30)

Tarquinius Superbus regnavit annos XXV. Hic prior hominibus inuenit lautumnas tormenta fustes metalla flagella carceres exilia. Ipse prior exilium meruit. Inter duos pontes a populo Romano fuste mactatus et positus in circo maximo sub delphinis. (31)

24 Romulus *non rubr.* V martis C: martir V¹: martio V² elie C regnavit *om.* C maii VetZ X] decem C anno C: annum V edd marcio V Frick VetZ in] usque a C ∞ *om.* C elegit romana C apellavit C seni ores elegit C Congiarium dedit] condidit C hominos C dum C natat VC: exercitum lustraret *scribendum* (*sicut in* Lib. de uir. illustr.) in palude C relatus] re[C: sellatus V: rellatus Frick: sublatu VetZ est appell[C 25 nolluisset V Frick 26 XVI] XLI Mom VetZ Vestae Frick: uestas V: uestales Mom VetZ scortinas V Frick 27 XXII] XXXII Mom VetZ uocauit V quicumque Mom¹ Frick 28 Marcus edd XXXIII V¹: XXXVI V² edd asse V Frick semissem Mom¹ (*bis*) hostiam V 29 annis V² calcaret et inuenisset V literis V Frick VetZ Oli Arnobius, *Aduersus nationes* 6.7.1, 5 (*pp.* 314.18, 315.19) et Seruius, *Comm. in Verg. Aen. libros* 8.345 (*p.* 251.5): olis V edd hodie quae V 30 Seruius Mom VetZ XLV Mom VetZ Hic prior V^a (*ex homoeoteleuti cum §31*): prior *canc.* V^b 31 adinuenit Mom¹ lautumnas V mactatus est Mom VetZ

The Eight Kings of Rome (23)

Romulus, the son of Mars and Ilia, ruled for thirty-eight years. He founded the city of Rome on 21 April, the day that is called Parilia. He established a year of ten months from March to December. He selected one thousand {'mille'} young men from the Roman people, whom he named soldiers {'milites'}, and one hundred older men {'seniores'}, whom he called senators. He gave three litres {'congius'} of wine to every twelve men as largesse {'congiarium'}. While he was swimming to the Palus Caprae {Goat's Pool}, he suddenly disappeared. He was deified and as a god was named Quirinus. (24)

Titus Tatius, the leader of the Sabines, ruled along with Romulus for five years. He buried the Vestal Virgin Tarpeia alive {under a pile of} weapons because she had refused to divulge Romulus' secrets to him. (25)

Numa Pompilius ruled for sixteen {= forty-one} years. He established the priests and the Vestal Virgins. He added two months to Romulus' ten, January for the gods above and February for the gods below. He was the first man to invent cots, tables, chairs, and lamp stands. He gave {the people} leather coins as largesse and the soldiers two and a half pounds of engraved bronze as a donative. (26)

Tullus Hostilius ruled for twenty-two {= thirty-two} years. He was the first to conduct a census and he decreed by edict that anyone who had committed fraud during his reign should give half a wether {= male castrated sheep} in exchange for his life. (27)

Marcus Philippus {= Ancus Marcius} ruled for thirty-three {= thirty-six} years. He gave {the people} a pound and a half of bronze as largesse and the soldiers two and a half pounds as a donative. He founded the colony of Ostia. (28)

L. Tarquinius Priscus ruled for twenty-eight years. When he was digging the foundations for the Capitolium, he found a human head with {the words} 'The head of King Olus' {'Caput Oli regis'} engraved {on it} in Etruscan letters, and so even today it is called the Capitolium. He was the first Roman to display two pairs of gladiators, which he provided for twenty-seven years. (29)

Servius Tullius, the son of a slave woman, ruled for twenty-five {= forty-five} years. He vowed that he would construct as many wickets for {the distribution of} public grain as years he had ruled. (30)

Tarquinius Superbus ruled for twenty-five years. He was the first man to invent penal quarries, tortures, cudgels, penal mines, whips, prison cells, and banishment. He himself was the first to deserve banishment. He was clubbed to death by the people of Rome between the two bridges {on Tiber Island} and buried in the Circus Maximus under the dolphins {= lap counters}. (31)

Nomina dictatorum (32)

P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, Fabius Maximus, Apulius Claudius, Popilius Lenas, Valerius Publicola, Pompeius Maximus, Eneas Iulius, Sulla Felix, Barbatus, Scipio Nasica, Aemilius Paulus, Fabius, Cincinnatus, Decimus, Titus Marius, P. Lutatius Catus, Marius Rutulus, Valerius Coruinius, Cornelius Scipio, P. Decius, Q. Fabius, Metellus Pius, Marius, Licinius Salinator, Curius Dentatus, Iulius Brutus. (33)

Imperia caesarum (34)

C. Iulius Caesar imperavit annos III, menses VII, dies VI. Congiarium dedit X C. Occisus curia Pompeia. (35)

Diuus Octavianus Augustus imperavit annos LVI, menses IIII, diem unum. Congiarium dedit ter X CCCLXIIS. Hoc imperante nauis Alexandrina primum in portu Romano introiuit nomine acatus, qui attulit frumenti modios CCCC, uectores ∞CC, <nautas CC,> piper, linteamen, carta, uitrea, et obeliscum cum sua sibi base, qui est in circo maximo, altum pedes LXXXVIIS. Excessit Nola. (36)

Tiberius Caesar imperavit annos XXII, menses VII, dies XXVIII. Congiarium dedit X LXXIIS. Hoc imperante in ciuitate Fidenis populo spectante amphitheatrum ruit et oppressit homines IIIICCV. Excessit Miseno. (37)

C. Gallicula imperavit annos III, menses VIII, dies XII. Congiarium dedit X LXXIIS et de basilica Iulia sparsit aureos et argenteos, in qua rapina perierunt homines XXXII, <mulieres> CCXLVII, et spado. Occisus palatio. (38)

Tiberius Claudius imperavit annos XIII, menses VIII, dies XXVII. Congiarium dedit X LXXV. Hoc imperante primum uenenarii et malefici comprehensi sunt; homines XLV, mulieres LXXXV ad supplicium ducti sunt. Hic metas in circo maximo deaurauit. Excessit palatio. (39)

Nero imperavit annos XIII, menses V, dies XXVIII. Congiarium dedit X C. Hoc imperante fuit polyfagus natione Alexandrinus nomine Arpocras, qui manducauit pauca: aprum coctum, gallinam uiuam cum suas sibi pennas, oua C, pineas C, clauos caligares, uitrea fracta, thallos de scopa palmea, mappas IIII, porcellum lactantem, manipulum feni et adhuc esuriens esse uidebatur. Nero occisus uia Patinaria. (40)

32 nomina *VetZ*: Item nomina *V Mom Frick* 33 **P.** cornelius. scipio africanus *V Mom^l* apulius. *V Mom^l* claudius ... iulius *non dist. V Mom^l* Laenas *VetZ* Aeneas *VetZ* Eneas, Iulius *Frick* sulla felix barbatus *V Mom^l* scipio nasica aemilius. paulus fabius cincinnatus *V (aemilius paulus) Mom^l* marius plutatius. catus marius rutulus. *V Mom^l* Plutatus *V Mom Frick*: Q. Lutatius *VetZ* coruinius cornelius. scipio. *V Mom^l* q. fabius metellus. pius *V Mom^l* Marius Licinius *Frick* curius. dentatus *V Mom^l* 34 Imperia *VetZ*: Item Imperia *V Mom Frick* 35 Iulius Caesar *non rubr. V XC V pro X semper X V et den. VetZ* octisus *V* 36 ter X] ter A *V CCCLXIIS]* pro S *semper semis VetZ* portu *V^l*: porto *V²* romane (?) *V^b*: romano *V^b* χιλιάδας v' *Cedr.*: CCCC *V* 'vectarios? vectorios?' *VetZ*, sed *vectores* = ἐπιβάτας *Cedr.* ναύτας σ' *Cedr.*: om. *V edd* uitria *V Frick*: nitria *Mom^l* opoliscum *V edd* LXXXVIIS] LXXXVII. semis *VetZ* 38 homines XXXIICCV *V Frick VetZ* octisus *V* palatio *V Frick* 39 uenerarii *V VetZ* 40 **Nero imperator** fagus natione *V^a*: annos ... fuit poly- *paruis litt. supra lineam add. V^b* solum Nerone imperatore fuit ... uidebatur *S* pollyfagus *S* Harpocras *VetZ* gallinam *S*: galinam *V Frick* pennas *S*: pinnas *V edd* galligares *V S edd* maniculum *V S* adhuc *S*: aduc *V* octisus *V*

The Names of the Dictators (32)

P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, {Q.} Fabius Maximus, Appius Claudius {Caecus}, Popillius Laenas, {P.} Valerius Publicola, {Cn.} Pompeius Magnus, Aeneas Iulius {?}, {L. Cornelius} Sulla Felix, {M. Hortatius} Barbatus, {P. Cornelius} Scipio Nasica, {L.} Aemilius Paullus, Fabius, {L. Quinctius} Cincinnatus, {P.} Decius Mus, Titus Manlius {Torquatus}, P. Lutatius Catulus, {C.} Marcius Rutulus, {M.} Valerius Corvinus, {P.} Cornelius Scipio {Aemilianus}, P. Decius {Mus}, Q. Fabius, {Q. Caecilius} Metellus Pius, {C.} Marius, {L.} Licinius {Lucullus, M. Livius} Salinator, {M.} Curius Dentatus, {M.} Iunius Brutus. (33)

The Reigns of the Caesars (34)

C. Julius Caesar was emperor for three years, seven months, and six days. He gave largesse of 100 denarii. He was killed in the Curia Pompeia. (35)

The Deified Octavian Augustus was emperor for fifty-six years, four months, and one day. He thrice gave largesse of 362½ denarii. While he was emperor an Alexandrian ship called an acatus entered the port of Rome for the first time, and it carried 400,000 *modii* of wheat, 1,200 passengers, <200 sailors,> pepper, linen, papyrus, glass, and an eighty-seven-and-a-half-foot high obelisk with its base, which is in the Circus Maximus. He died in Nola. (36)

Tiberius Caesar was emperor for twenty-two years, seven months, and twenty-eight days. He gave largesse of seventy-two and a half denarii. While he was emperor the amphitheatre at Fidenae collapsed when it was full of spectators and 4,205 people were killed. He died in Misenum. (37)

C. Caligula was emperor for three years, eight months, and twelve days. He gave largesse of seventy-two and a half denarii and scattered gold and silver coins from the Basilica Julia, but in the riotous scramble {for the money} thirty-two men, 247 <women,> and a eunuch were killed. He was killed in the palace. (38)

Tiberius Claudius was emperor for thirteen years, eight months, and twenty-seven days. He gave largesse of seventy-five denarii. While he was emperor poisoners and sorcerers were arrested for the first time; forty-five men and eighty-five women were punished. He gilded the turning posts in the Circus Maximus. He died in the palace. (39)

Nero was emperor for fourteen years, five months, and twenty-eight days. He gave largesse of 100 denarii. While he was emperor there was an Alexandrian polyphage named Harpocras, who ate a few things: a cooked boar, a live chicken with its feathers, 100 eggs, 100 pine cones, hob nails, broken glass, branches from a palm broom, four napkins, a suckling pig, a bundle of hay, and he still appeared to be hungry. Nero was killed on the Via Patinaria. (40)

Galba imperavit menses VIII, dies XII. Congiarium promisit sed non dedit. Hic domum suam deposuit et horrea Galbae instituit. Decollatus foro Romano iacuit. (41)

Otho imperavit dies XC. Ipse se Brixellis interfecit. (42)

Bittellus imperavit menses VIII, dies XI. Occisus palatio. (43)

Dius Vespasianus imperavit annos XII, menses VIII, dies XXVIII. Congiarium dedit X LXXV. Hic prior tribus gradibus amphitheatrum dedicavit. Excessit Curibus Sabinis. (44)

Dius Titus imperavit <annos II, menses II, dies XX. Congiarium dedit X LXXV.> Hic ad amphitheatrum tribus gradibus patris sui duos adiecit. Excessit Curibus Sabinis cubiculo patris. (45)

Domitianus imperavit annos XVII, menses V, dies V. Congiarium dedit ter X LXXV. Hoc imperante multae operae publicae fabricatae sunt: atria VII, horrea piperataria ubi modo est basilica Constantiniana et horrea Vespasiani, templum Castorum et Mineruae, portam Capenam, gentem Flauiam, Diuorum, Iseum et Serapeum, Mineruam chalcidicam, odeum, Minuciam ueterem, stadium, et thermas Titianas et Traianas, amphitheatrum usque ad clypea, templum Vespasiani et Titi, Capitolium, senatum, ludos IIII, palatium, metam sudantem, et pantheum. Occisus palatio. (46)

Nerua imperavit annos V, menses IIII, diem unum. Congiarium dedit X LXXV et funeraticium plebi urbanae instituit X LXIIS. Excessit hortis Salustianis. (47)

Traianus imperavit annos XIX, menses IIII, dies XXVII. Congiarium dedit X DCL. Hoc imperante mulieres in thermis Traianis lauerunt. VII idus Iulias excessit Selinunti. (48)

Adrianus imperavit annos XX, menses X, dies XIII. Congiarium dedit X ∞. Hoc imperante templum Romae et Veneris fabricatum est. Excessit Bais Veteribus. (49)

Antoninus Pius imperavit annos XXII, menses VIII, dies XXVIII. Congiarium dedit X DCCC. Hoc imperante circensibus Apollinaribus partectorum columna ruit et oppressit homines ∞CXII. Excessit Lorio. (50)

Dius Verus imperavit annos VII, menses VIII, dies XII. Congiarium dedit X CCCC. Hoc imperante scrofa porcellum peperit in effigiem elefanti. Excessit Alitino. (51)

41 decollatus V Mom Frick 42 Otho imp. V 43 Vitellius Mom VetZ 44 dies] di V am/
amphiteatrum V : amphiteatrum Frick curis V Frick 45 imperavit annos VIII, dies XII. Con-
giarium promisit sed non dedit ex § 41 V Frick : imp. annos Mom VetZ hic amphi-
theatrum a tribus V Mom Frick : hic amphitheatro a tribus VetZ curis V Frick 46 dies] di V
multa V capaena V : Capaenam Frick diuorum] diuorum porticus non recte Eutr. Hier. miner-
nam calcidicam V calcidicam Mom¹ Frick odeum Mom¹ Frick : odium Hier. Mom VetZ : syn-
odum V Forum Traiani ante thermas Titianas et Traianas Hier. termas V Frick amphiteatrum
V Frick clipea Mom¹ ludos IIII] ludus matutinus Hier. micam auream, metam sudantem Mom¹
ex Hier. (mica aurea, meta sudans) panteum V edd 47 Nerua imp. V funeraticum V
VetZ 48 termis V Frick silenunti V Frick 49 Hadrianus VetZ dies] di V 50 appoli-
naribus V Frick 51 solum Diuo uero imperatore scrofa ... elefanti S effigiem S : figiem V

Galba was emperor for eight months and twelve days. He promised largesse but did not give it. He demolished his own house and built 'Galba's Warehouse' {on the site}. He was beheaded {and his body} lay in the Roman Forum. (41)

Otho was emperor for ninety days. He committed suicide in Brixellum. (42)

Vitellius was emperor for eight months and eleven days. He was killed in the palace. (43)

The Deified Vespasian was emperor for twelve years, eight months, and twenty-eight days. He gave largesse of seventy-five denarii. He was the first to dedicate an amphitheatre {the Colosseum} with three tiers of seats. He died in Cures Sabini. (44)

The Deified Titus was emperor for <two years, two months, and twenty days. He gave largesse of seventy-five denarii>. He added two tiers to his father's amphitheatre of three. He died in his father's bedroom in Cures Sabini. (45)

Domitian was emperor for seventeen years, five months, and five days. He thrice gave largesse of seventy-five denarii. While he was emperor many public buildings were constructed: seven public halls, the Pepper Warehouses where the Basilica Constantiniana now is and Vespasian's Warehouses; the Temples of Castor and Pollux and of Minerva; the Capena Gate; the Temples of the Flavian Family and of the Deified Emperors, the Iseum and the Serapeum, and the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica; the Odeum; the {Porticus} Minucia Vetus; the Stadium; the Baths of Titus and Trajan; the amphitheatre up to the level of the shield-portraits; the Temple of Vespasian and Titus; the Capitolium; the Senate; four gladiatorial schools; the palace; the Meta Sudans; and the Pantheon. He was killed in the palace. (46)

Nerva was emperor for five years, four months, and one day. He gave largesse of seventy-five denarii and established a funeral fund for the urban plebs of sixty-two and a half denarii. He died in the Gardens of Sallust. (47)

Trajan was emperor for nineteen years, four months, and twenty-seven days. He gave largesse of 650 denarii. While he was emperor women {were allowed to} bathe in the Baths of Trajan. He died in Selinous on 9 July. (48)

Hadrian was emperor for twenty years, ten months, and fourteen days. He gave largesse of 1,000 denarii. While he was emperor the Temple of Rome and Venus was built. He died in Old Baiae. (49)

Antoninus Pius was emperor for twenty-two years, eight months, and twenty-eight days. He gave largesse of 800 denarii. While he was emperor a column supporting the supplementary seating {of the Circus Maximus} collapsed during the chariot races in honour of Apollo and crushed 1,112 people. He died at Lorium. (50)

The Deified Verus was emperor for seven years, eight months, and twelve days. He gave largesse of 400 denarii. While he was emperor a sow gave birth to a piglet that looked like an elephant. He died in Altinum. (51)

Marcus Antoninus imperavit annos XVIII, menses XI, dies XIII. Congiarium dedit X DCCCL. Hoc imperante instrumenta debitorum fisco in foro Romano arserunt per dies XXX. Excessit Pannonia Superiore. (52)

Commalus imperavit annos XVI, menses VIII, dies XII. Congiarium dedit X DCCCL. Hoc imperante thermae Commodianae dedicatae sunt. Excessit domo Victiliana. (53)

Pertinax imperavit dies LXXV. Congiarium dedit X CL. Excessit palatio. (54)

Iulianus imperavit dies LXV. Occisus palatio. (55)

Dius Seuerus imperavit annos XVII, menses XI, dies XXVIII. Congiarium dedit X ∞C. Hoc imperante Septizonium et thermae Seuerianae dedicatae sunt. Excessit Britanniae. (56)

Geta imperavit menses X, dies XII. Occisus palatio. (57)

Antoninus Magnus imperavit annos VI, menses II, dies XV. Congiarium dedit X CCCC. Hoc imperante ianuae circi ampliatæ sunt et thermae Antoninianae dedicatae sunt. Hic suam matrem habuit. Excessit inter Edissam et Carras. (58)

Macrinus imperavit anno uno, menses III, dies II. Congiarium dedit X CL. Hoc imperante amphitheatrum arsit. Occisus Arcelaide. (59)

Antoninus Eliogaballus imperavit annos VI, menses VIII, dies XVIII. Congiarium dedit X CCL. Eliogaballum dedicatum est. Occisus Romae. (60)

Alexander imperavit annos XIII, menses VIII, dies IX. Congiarium dedit X DC. Hoc imperante fuit polyfagus natione Italus qui manducauit pauca: cistam, lactucas, uascellum sardinarium, sardas X, melopepones LXX, thallos de scopa palmea, mappas IIII, panes castrenses IIII, cistam, cardos cum suas sibi spinas, et ebibit uini Graecanicum plenum, et uenit ad templum Iasurae et ebibit labrum plenum et adhuc esuriens esse uidebatur. Et thermae Alexandrinae dedicatae sunt. Alexander occisus Mogontiaco. (61)

Maximinus imperavit annos III, menses III, dies duos. Congiarium dedit X CL. Hoc imperante magna pugna fuit cum Romanis et praetorianis. Occisus Aquileia. (62)

Duo Gordiani imperauerunt dies XX. Excesserunt Africae. (63)

Pupienus et Balbinus imperauerunt dies XCIX. Congiarium dederunt X CCL. Occisi Romae. (64)

Gordianus imperavit annos V, menses V, dies V. Congiarium dedit X CCCL. Hoc imperante mula hominem comedit. Agonem Mineruae instituit. Excessit finibus Partiae. (65)

52 instrumenta debitorum hoc imperante fisci V¹ fisco *Descr. cons.* : fisci V *edd* 53 Commodus *edd* dies] di V terme commodiane dedicate V *Frick* 54 ccisus palatio *post* dies LXXV *ex* § 55 V^a : *canc.* Vb 55 octisus V 56 termes (terme *Frick*) seueriane dedicate V *Frick* Britanniae *Mom*¹ 58 ianue circi ampliatæ sunt et termæ antoniniane dedicate V *Frick* edissa V : Edessa *Mom VetZ* 59 annum unum *VetZ* dies] di V Arcelaide V *edd* 60 elio gaballus V^a : Heliogaballus *VetZ* Heliogaballum *VetZ* 61 dies] di V *solum* Alexandro imperatore fuit ... uidebatur S pollyfagus S polyfagus ... natione *Mom*¹ melopopones V *Mom*¹ *Frick* thallos *VetZ* : tallos V S *Mom Frick* grecanicum V¹ S *Mom Frick* : grecanium V² : graecanici cadum *VetZ* (*ex coniectura Mom.*) lasurae V *Mom*¹ *Frick* aduc V terme V *Frick* dedicate V *Frick* 62 dies] di V 63 Duo gordiani ... africae *post* occisus aquileia *in eadem linea scr. et* Duo gordiani *non rubr.* V 64 Pupienus *Mom*¹ 65 *solum* Gordiano imperatore hoc ... comedit S Parthiae *VetZ*

Marcus Aurelius was emperor for eighteen years, eleven months, and fourteen days. He gave largesse of 850 denarii. While he was emperor the state's debtors' records were burned in the Roman Forum over a thirty-day period. He died in Pannonia Superior. (52)

Commodus was emperor for sixteen years, eight months, and twelve days. He gave largesse of 850 denarii. While he was emperor the Baths of Commodus were dedicated. He died in the Domus Vectiliana. (53)

Pertinax was emperor for seventy-five days. He gave largesse of 150 denarii. He died in the palace. (54)

Julian was emperor for sixty-five days. He was killed in the palace. (55)

The Deified Severus was emperor for seventeen years, eleven months, and twenty-eight days. He gave largesse of 1,100 denarii. While he was emperor the Septizodium and the Baths of Severus were dedicated. He died in Britain. (56)

Geta was emperor for ten months and twelve days. He was killed in the palace. (57)

Antoninus the Great {= Caracalla} was emperor for six years, two months, and fifteen days. He gave largesse of 400 denarii. While he was emperor the gateways to the Circus were enlarged and the Baths of Antoninus were dedicated. He had sexual relations with his mother. He died between Edessa and Carrhae. (58)

Macrinus was emperor for one year, four months, and two days. He gave largesse of 150 denarii. While he was emperor the amphitheatre was destroyed by fire. He was killed in Archelais. (59)

Antoninus Elagabalus was emperor for six years, eight months, and eighteen days. He gave largesse of 250 denarii. The Heliogabalium was dedicated. He was killed in Rome. (60)

Alexander was emperor for thirteen years, eight months, and nine days. He gave largesse of 600 denarii. While he was emperor there was an Italian polyphage who ate a few things: a box, lettuces, a sardine pot, ten sardines, seventy melons, the branches of a palm broom, four napkins, four military-sized loaves of bread, a box, and thistles with their thorns, and he drank a Greek pot full of wine and went to the Temple of Iasura and drank a tub full {of wine} and still appeared to be hungry. And the Baths of Alexander were dedicated. Alexander was killed in Moguntiacum. (61)

Maximinus was emperor for three years, four months, and two days. He gave largesse of 150 denarii. While he was emperor there was a great battle between the people of Rome and the Praetorian Guard. He was killed in Aquileia. (62)

The two Gordians were emperors for twenty days. They died in Africa. (63)

Pupienus and Balbinus were emperors for ninety-nine days. They gave largesse of 250 denarii. They were killed in Rome. (64)

Gordian was emperor for five years, five months, and five days. He gave largesse of 350 denarii. While he was emperor a she-mule ate a person. He established the Contest of Minerva. He died on the borders of Parthia. (65)

Duo Philippi imperauerunt annos V, menses V, dies XXIX. Congiarium dederunt X CCCL. Hi saeculares ueros in circo maximo ediderunt. Occisus senior Verona, iunior Romae in castris praetoriis. (66)

Decius imperauit annum unum, menses XI, dies XVIII. Congiarium dedit X CCL. Hoc imperante thermae Commodianae dedicatae sunt. Occisus praetorio Abrypto. (67)

Gallus et Volusianus imperauerunt annos II, menses IIII, dies IX. Congiarium dederunt X CCL. His imperantibus magna mortalitas fuit. Occisi in Foro Flamini. (68)

Aemilianus imperauit dies LXXXVIII. Occisus ponte Sanguinario. (69)

Gallienus cum Valeriano imperauit annos XIII, menses IIII, dies XXVIII. Valerianus occisus in Syria. Gallienus congiarium dedit X ∞CCL et binionem aureum. Occisus Mediolano. (70)

Claudius imperauit annum unum, menses IIII, dies XIII. Congiarium dedit X CCL. Excessit Sirmi. (71)

Quintillus imperauit dies LXXVII. Congiarium promisit sed non dedit. Occisus Aquilegia. (72)

Aurelianus imperauit annos V, menses IIII, dies XX. Congiarium dedit X D. Hic muro urbem cinxit. Templum Solis et castra in campo Agrippae dedicauit. Genium populi Romani aureum in rostra posuit. Porticus thermarum Antoninianarum arsit et fabricata est. Panem oleum et salem populo iussit dari gratuite. Agonem Solis instituit. Occisus Ceno Fluiuio. (73)

Tacitus imperauit menses VIII, dies XII. Occisus Ponto. (74)

Florianus imperauit dies LXXXVIII. Occisus Tharso. (75)

Probus imperauit annos VI, menses II, dies XII. Hoc imperante senatores agitaerunt in circo maximo missos <X>XIII. Occisus Sirmi. (76)

Carus imperauit menses X, dies V. Excessit Seleucia Babilonis. (77)

Carinus et Numerianus imperauerunt annos II, menses XI, dies II. Congiarium dederunt X D. His imperantibus fames magna fuit et operae publicae arserunt: senatum, forum Caesaris, basilicam Iuliam, et graecostadium. Occisus campo Margense. (78)

66 seculares V edd Veronae Mom¹ pretoriis V Frick 67 dies] di V thermae commodiane dedicate V Frick Commodianae] Decianae scribendum? 68 solum Gallo et uolusiano imperatoribus magna mortalitas fuit S 69 sanguinaio V^o 72 Aquileia Mom 73 agrippe V Frick porticus V¹ : porticos V² termarum V Mom Frick Antoninianarum arserunt et fabricatum V edd sale V Frick : sal Mom VetZ Caenophrurio Mom VetZ : Cenofrurio Frick 76 missus VetZ XIII V edd 77 Babyloniae Mom VetZ 78 publice V Frick patrimonium (?) inter caesaris et basilicam V : del. edd (confer § 79) : et transitorium scribendum ? greco stadium V Frick

The two Philips were emperors for five years, five months, and twenty-nine days. They gave largesse of 350 denarii. They celebrated the true Secular Games in the Circus Maximus. The elder was killed in Verona, the younger in the Praetorian Camp in Rome. (66)

Decius was emperor for one year, eleven months, and eighteen days. He gave largesse of 250 denarii. While he was emperor the Baths of Commodus {Decius} were dedicated. He was killed in his camp headquarters' building in Abritus. (67)

Gallus and Volusian were emperors for two years, four months, and nine days. They gave largesse of 250 denarii. While they were emperors many people died {from plague}. They were killed in Forum Flaminii. (68)

Aemilian was emperor for eighty-eight days. He was killed on the Sanguinarus Bridge. (69)

Gallienus was emperor **with Valerian** for fourteen years, four months, and twenty-eight days. Valerian was killed in Syria. Gallienus gave largesse of 1,250 denarii and a golden *binio*.^{*} He was killed in Milan. (70)

Claudius was emperor for one year, four months, and fourteen days. He gave largesse of 250 denarii. He died in Sirmium. (71)

Quintillus was emperor for seventy-seven days. He promised largesse but did not give it. He was killed in Aquileia. (72)

Aurelian was emperor for five years, four months, and twenty days. He gave largesse of 500 denarii. He surrounded the city with a wall, dedicated the Temple of Sol and a camp {for the urban cohorts} in the Field of Agrippa, and placed a golden statue representing the Genius of the Roman People on the Rostra {in the Forum}. The portico of the Baths of Antoninus was destroyed by fire and rebuilt. He ordered bread, oil, and salt to be given to the people for free. He established the Contest of Sol. He was killed in Caenofrurium. (73)

Tacitus was emperor for eight months and twelve days. He was killed in Pontus. (74)

Florian was emperor for eighty-eight days. He was killed in Tarsus. (75)

Probus was emperor for six years, two months, and twelve days. While he was emperor the senators staged <twenty>-four chariot races in the Circus Maximus {in a single day}. He was killed in Sirmium. (76)

Carus was emperor for ten months and five days. He died in Seleucia of Babylon. (77)

Carinus and Numerian were emperors for two years, eleven months, and two days. They gave largesse of 500 denarii. While they were emperors there was a great famine and {the following} public buildings were destroyed by fire: the senate house, the Forum of Caesar, the Basilica Julia, and the Graecostadium. He was killed in the territory of Margus. (78)

* A 'double aureus' (thus fifty denarii) that only weighed as much as one and a half aurei.

Diocletianus et Maximianus imperauerunt annos XXI, menses XI, dies XII. Congiarium dederunt X ∞DL. His imperantibus multae operae publicae fabricatae sunt: senatum, forum Caesaris, basilicam Iuliam, scaenam Pompei, porticos II, nympha III, templa II, Iseum et Serapeum, arcum nouum, thermas Diocletianas. Sparserunt in circo aureos et argenteos. Partectorum podium ruit et oppressit homines XIII. Et mulier nomine Irene peperit pueros tres et puellam. Regem Persarum cum omnibus gentibus <ceperunt> et tunicas eorum ex margaritis numero XXXII circa templa posuerunt. Elephantes XIII, agitatores VI, equos CCL in urbem adduxerunt. Excessit Diocletianus Salonis, Maximianus in Gallia. (79)

Constantius et Maximianus imperauerunt annos XVI, menses VIII, dies XII. Congiarium dederunt bis X ∞D. Constancius excessit in Gallia, Maximianus in Dardania. (80)

Seuerus imperauit annos III, menses IIII, dies XV. Ipse se interfecit uia Latina miliario III. (81)

Maxentius imperauit annos VI. Hoc imperante templum Romae arsit et fabricatum est. Thermas in palatio fecit et circum in catecumbas. Fames magna fuit. Romani traxerunt militem Moesiacum et occisi sunt Romani a militibus homines VI. Romanis omnibus aurum indixit et dederunt. Fossatum <fodire coepit> sed non perfecit. Occisus ad pontem Muluium in Tiberim. (82)

Maximianus imperauit annos IX, menses VIII, dies VI. Occisus Tarso. (83)

Lucinius imperauit annos XV, menses IIII, dies XVI. Occisus Thessalonica. (84)

79 multe opere publice fabricate V Frick basilica Iulia scena (scaena Mom VetZ) pompeii V Mom Frick VetZ porticus VetZ templa II Iseum et Serapeum non dist. edd termeas V parte itorum V podium V edd XIII V gentibus et V edd domini posuerunt V edd (sed 'Domini ist Zusatz eines christlichen Copisten' Mom¹; 'uidetur a librario additum esse, quamquam potest accipi pro nominatiuo pluralis' Mom) salonis VetZ: salonas V Mom Frick: Salona Mom¹ 80 annos XVI (I add. V²) quo tempore fuit persecutio et cessauit episcopatum annos VII, menses VI, dies XXV et hic (in fo. 65r) laterculum Liberianum (ex Marcellino episcopo, Chron. min. I: 75.35–6) et Notitiam regionum urbis XIV inser. et in fo. 70r Breuiarium rursum incip. V Constantius Mom VetZ Dardania Mom¹ 81 miliario Mom¹ 82 est edd: et V termas V Frick VI V ferunt V: aperuit edd 83 Maximinus VetZ 84 Licinius edd

Diocletian and Maximian were emperors for twenty one years, eleven months, and twelve days. They gave largesse of 1,550 denarii. While they were emperors many public buildings were constructed: the senate house, the Forum of Caesar, the Basilica Julia, the stage of the Theatre of Pompey, two porticos, three nymphaea, two temples, the Iseum and the Serapeum, the New Arch, and the Baths of Diocletian. They scattered gold and silver coins in the Circus {Maximus}. The supporting wall of the supplementary seating {in the Circus Maximus} collapsed and crushed 13,000 people. And a woman named Irene gave birth to three boys and a girl. They captured the king of the Persians with all his family and put thirty-two of their pearl tunics {on display} around the temples {in Rome}. They brought thirteen elephants, six elephant drivers, and 250 horses into the city. Diocletian died in Salonae and Maximian in Gaul. (79)

Constantius and Maximian {= Galerius} were emperors for sixteen years, eight months, and twelve days. They twice gave largesse of 1,500 denarii. Constantius died in Gaul, Maximian in Dardania. (80)

Severus was emperor for three years, four months, and fifteen days. He killed himself on the Via Latina, three miles {from Rome}. (81)

Maxentius was emperor for six years. While he was emperor the Temple of Rome was destroyed by fire and rebuilt. He built baths in the palace and a circus over the catacombs. There was a great famine {when the African grain shipments were cut off}. The people of Rome lynched a Moesian soldier and 6,000 of them were killed by the soldiers. He imposed a tax in gold on all the people of Rome and they paid it. He <began to dig> a {defensive} trench {against Constantine}, but did not finish it. He was killed in the Tiber at the Milvian Bridge. (82)

Maximinus was emperor for nine years, eight months, and six days. He was killed in Tarsus. (83)

Licinius was emperor for fifteen years, four months, and sixteen days. He was killed in Thessalonica. (84)

APPENDIX 4. PARALLELS IN OTHER TEXTS

The purpose of this appendix is twofold:

1. To present texts that provide close parallels in both content and wording with passages from the *Breviarium*. I do not have the space to present a complete list of general parallels, just verbal parallels.¹

2. To compare the *Breviarium*'s list of the locations of the emperors' deaths with other texts written or compiled in the fourth century, particularly Eusebius and the *KG*. One could compare many other aspects of these texts, particularly the method of death, and include all the texts that were employed in the analyses in Chapter 5, but that would turn what was originally intended to be a short appendix into something even larger than Chapter 5.

The main goal of these comparisons is to provide a basic historiographical context for the analyses and conclusions in the main chapters above.

Such comparisons are the necessary first steps in *Quellenforschung*, but unfortunately, as will be seen below, we can hardly progress beyond them. The sort of sub-literary texts that we are evaluating here have left little trace in the surviving literature from the ancient, medieval, and Byzantine worlds, and so there is very little that we can say concretely about the *Breviarium*'s sources.

In each comparison below the text from the *Breviarium* comes first, in italics, and then any parallels follow, headed by the source citation. To save space, if a source or sources do not indicate a death-place, they are not quoted unless there is a particular reason for doing so. Texts that provide verbal parallels from unrelated historical contexts are introduced by 'Verbal parallel(s)'. While detailed commentaries could easily be provided for all the parallels, that is beyond my purpose here. The conclusions that arise from the pre-imperial parallels within the narrow context of this appendix are for the most part obvious enough and so I do not belabour them with commentaries. The situation is more complicated with regard to the imperial death-places, and so I have appended short commentaries to each of these where necessary as a means of drawing out important observations and conclusions regarding the texts themselves and the historical traditions that lie behind them.

As we analyse the parallels below, we need to keep in mind the following associations:

1. Parallels in the pre-Roman material with texts that now survive in Greek.
2. Parallels in the material on the regal period with Eusebius, Jerome, and other late Roman Latin accounts.

1 Interested readers should consult the basic notes of Mommsen 1850: 649–55, Mommsen 1892:143–8 (foot of page), and Valentini and Zucchetti 1940: 269–81 (foot of page). The work as a whole really does cry out for a proper modern commentary.

3. Parallels of wording and content with surviving Latin *consularia* of the fourth to sixth centuries.

4. Parallels in the emperors' death-places with the so-called *Series regum*, a Greek text that is known only from a much later Armenian translation (described below); Eusebius; and the witnesses to the *KG*. The parallels with the *KG* are to be considered in the light of the conclusions of Appendix 2.

I shall return to this list at the end of the comparisons.

* * *

The following appendix presents a reasonably complete collection of verbal parallels that the *Breviarium* shares with other surviving Greek and Latin texts, particularly those from the fourth century. A few comments on these texts is necessary before beginning.

Although the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* survives only in a Latin translation made in the 780s and therefore is quoted in Latin below, the original was written in Greek in the mid-sixth century and its evidence is therefore Greek in origin in spite of the Latin text (see Burgess 2013).

The anonymous Armenian *Series regum* (a modern title) is found in the manuscripts of the Armenian translation of Eusebius, between the *Chronographia* and the *Canones* (Karst, xii, xx–xxi, 144–55). Its origins are unknown, but the original was Greek: the non-imperial material derives from Eusebius, as we saw was the case with the Alban kings in Table 2B of Chapter 3. However, the list of imperial *Todesarten* (as Karst, 154, calls them) and death-places, the only part of this text that interests us here, was not compiled from Eusebius, nor from any other known history (as we shall see). It breaks off in the middle of the entry on Balbinus and Pupienus and is missing Julius Caesar (the space is filled with the entry for Caligula).

Eusebius presents a problem for quotation since the Greek text no longer survives. Unlike the situation in Chapter 5, where we could rely on Jerome's Latin translation to provide us with an accurate view of Eusebius' regnal durations, here we are faced with the problem that Jerome added words, phrases, sentences, and even completely new entries to his translation of Eusebius' text (as we saw in Chapter 3, and see below). Rather than cite every possible witness to Eusebius' original text, it is enough here to list the Armenian translation first, where it exists; then any of the major Greek witnesses: Syncellus, the *Chronicon paschale*, and the *Anonymus matritensis*; and finally Jerome. Only where the Armenian or Greek texts are lacking or insufficient do I cite the modern Latin translations of the Syriac epitomes preserved in the so-called *Chronicon ad an. 724*, which, in spite of its name, was written c. 640, and/or the chronicle of Ps-Dionysius, written c. 775.² Where they are not cited and the parallel exists, they always support the evidence of the other texts, except in one case (§ 60).

While Jerome translated Eusebius' *Chron. can.* into Latin and so is usually cited as a witness to that chronicle (as is the case throughout Chapter 5), he also

2 For these two texts and Eusebius see Burgess 1999: 26, to which can be added Witakowski 1996: xv–xxv and Harrak 1999: 1–17 for Ps-Dionysius.

added to it material from an epitome of regal and Republican history (or two epitomes), as we saw in Chapter 3, and from the *KG*. The possibility of Jerome's use of these texts in his accounts of Roman history to supplement or modify Eusebius' text, as noted above. It also means that Jerome can be cited below alongside Eusebian witnesses, alongside witnesses to the *KG*, and independently, depending on the source he is judged to have used for that passage.

Finally, Jerome added to his translation of the *Chron. can.* many entries with close verbal parallels to the building projects mentioned in the *Breviarium*; some of these are also shared by Eutropius, who in one case is closer to the *Breviarium* than Jerome.³ Eutropius and Jerome shared a common source, the *KG*, and Occam's razor suggests these common notices were taken from the *KG*.⁴ But Jerome and Eutropius could also have found them independently in a source similar to the one used by the compiler of the *Breviarium*, whatever that may have been. As a result, these particular architectural texts are cited below as 'KG?'.

THE PARALLELS

2–22

Picus to Remus, the names and regnal years of pre-Roman kings.

See Chapter 3.

2

Picus Saturni filius regnavit agro Laurentino usque ad eum locum ubi nunc Roma est annis XXXVIII.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Arm., Karst, 136.7–9), '... sagen, ... daß Pikos, Sohn des Kronos, zuerst als König geherrscht habe in des Laurentos Lande, bis zu der Stätte, wo jetzt Rom steht, 37 Jahre = Syncellus, 200.14–16, φασὶ Πείκον υἱὸν Κρόνου βασιλεῦσαι χώρας Λαυρέντου λζ', εἶναι δὲ τὴν χώραν ἕως τῆς νυνὶ Ῥώμης πόλεως (see also 284.12).

Eo tempore ibi nec oppida nec uici erant, sed passim habitauerunt.

Malalas 1.13.36–37, ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς χρόνοις οὔτε πόλεις οὔτε διοίκησις τις ἦν ἐν τῇ δύσει, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς οἰκεῖτο πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἐκείνη (see also *Chron. Scal.* 236.1–2, 'sicut sine urbes et sine reges essent' and 18–19, 'Erant enim omnes partes illas sine urbes et sine regem').

3

Faunus Pici filius eisdem locis regnavit annis XLIII.

3 I have not included in the comparisons the architectural entries that Jerome copied from Eusebius.

4 Burgess 1995a: 357–8, 359, 361, 362, 365, 366.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Arm., Karst, 136.9–10), ‘Und nach ihm Phaunos, Sohn des Pikos, 44 Jahre’ = Syncellus, 200.16–17, Φαῦνον τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Πείκου ... ἔτη μδ’ (see also 284.13).

Eo tempore Hercules, cum ab Hispania reuerteretur, aram quae est Romae ad forum boarium posuit et dedicauit, eo quod Cacum filium Vulcani ibi in spelunca sua occiderat.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Arm., Karst, 136.10–12), ‘Unter welchem Herakles, aus dem Lande Spania hergezogen, einen Altar errichtete auf dem Boarischen-Marktplatze, von wegen daß er den “Bösen”, Sohn des Ephestos getötet hatte’ = Syncellus, 200.17–19, καθ’ ὃν Ἡρακλῆς ἀπὸ Σπανίας ἐπανελθὼν ἐν φόρῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ βοαρίῳ βωμὸν ἤγειρε, διότι ἀνείλε Κάκος τὸν Ἡφαίστου υἱόν (see also 284.13–14).

Chron. Scal., 238.20–2, ‘Eraclius ab Spanorum partibus rediens arma sua posuit in Roma in Boarium Forum, in templo clausit’ (see also Malalas 7.1.4–8, which also involves τὰ ὅπλα [*arma*] rather than the expected βωμὸν [*aram*]).

5

Latinus eisdem locis regnavit <annis XXXVI>. Hic ex suo nomine ciues suos Latinos appellauit.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Arm., Karst, 136.13–14), ‘Nach welchem Latinos regierte 36 Jahre; woher auch die Latiner geheißen sind’ = Syncellus, 200.20, Λατίνος ἔτη λς’ (see also 284.14).

Chron. Scal., 240.8–10, ‘Latinus ... regnavit in ipsa prouintia annos XVIII, et de eius nomine Romeos, qui et Cittei uocantur, Latinos nominauit’ = Malalas, 6.18.50–2, ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὁ αὐτὸς Λατίνος ἔτη ιη΄, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ιδίου ὀνόματος τοὺς Κιτιαίους καλουμένους ἐπωνόμασε Λατίνους.

Hoc regnante Troia capta est, unde Aeneas Veneris et Anchisae filius uenit et se cum Latino iunxit unaque bellum gesserunt aduersus Rutulos. Eo proelio Latinus occisus est et regnum eius penes Aeneam remansit.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Arm., Karst, 136.14–16), ‘In dessen dreiunddreißigsten Jahre wurde Ilion genommen. Nach welchem Enias des Anchises mit den Rutulern kriegend den Turnos tötete und des Latinos Tochter Lavinia heiratete’ = Syncellus, 200.20–23, τούτου κατὰ τὸ λγ’ ἔτος Αἰνείας ἐξ Ἰλίου παραγενόμενος ... συμμαχήσας τε αὐτῷ Λατίνῳ κατὰ Ρουτούλων καὶ ... Λαβινία ζεύγνυται Λατίνου θυγατρὶ τοῦ βασιλέως (see also 284.14–16).

Chron. Scal., 240.12–16, ‘Temporibus illis Eneas, Anchisso et Afroditis filius, uenit de Libya et cum Latino se coniunxit et fecit pugna cum illos Rutullos. Et in ipsa pugna Latinus occisus est, et imperium eius sumpsit Eneas’ = Malalas 6.23.67–70+24.84–5, ὁ Αἰνείας ... ἐξώρμησεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν πρὸς τὸν Λατίνον· καὶ ἑαυτὸν συμμίξας αὐτῷ ... ἐπολέμησαν τοῖς Ρουσοῦλοις· καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν πόλεμον ὁ Λατίνος ... ἐσφάγη. ... ἔλαβεν ὁ Αἰνείας μετὰ τὴν νίκην τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τοῦ Λατίνου Ἀλβανίαν (*sic*).

Commentary. Note that only the *Chron. Scal.* and Malalas have a parallel for the last sentence, even though in the other passages quoted here their accounts are less closely related to the *Breviarium*.

7

Aeneas oppidum condidit Lauinium ibique regnavit annis tribus.

Eusebius, *Chronographia* (Arm., Karst, 136.16–17), ‘und (Enias) baute die Stadt Lavinia, von wo ab er regierte 3 Jahre’ = Syncellus, 200.24–5, Αἰνείας ... βασιλεύει τῆς χώρας μετὰ τὸν Λατίνον ἔτη γ’, κτίσας πόλιν ἐπ’ ὀνόματι τῆς γυναικὸς Λαβινίαν, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐβασίλευσε (see also 201.4).

Chron. Scal., 240.16, Eneas ... condidit Libyniam ciuitatem’ = Malalas 6.25.91, ἔκτισεν τὴν Λαβινίαν πόλιν.

8

Ascanius Aeneae filius regnavit annis XXXVI. Albam Longam condidit.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 172), ‘Askanius des Enias gründete die Stadt Alban’ = Syncellus, 207.9–10, ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀσκάnios ἔτη λζ’, ὁ υἱὸς Αἰνείου ὃς ἔκτισε πόλιν Ἀλβαν = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 62^e, ‘Ascanius Aeneae filius Albam urbem condidit’.

Chron. Scal., 240.20–1, ‘Post autem Eneae mortem Ascanius filius eius regnavit ibi annos XXXV et condidit Albaniam’ (see also Malalas 6.24.85–6, κτίζει ἐκεῖ πόλιν ... ἡντινα ἐπωνόμασεν Ἀλβανίαν).

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 63^e, ‘Ascanius ... Albam Longam condidit’.

10

Posthumus Siluius Aeneae nepos regnavit annis XXXVII. Ab hoc postea prognati Albae regnauerunt ac Silui sunt cognominati.

Chron. Scal. 240.23–5, ‘regnavit Albas Postumius ille Eneae nepus annos XXXVI et condidit Siluem. Ab isto qui postea reges Siluani uocati sunt’ = Malalas 6.29.13–14, ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀλβας ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀσκανίου ἔτη λς’. καὶ κτίζει τὴν Σίλβαν πόλιν (ἀπὸ τότε οἱ βασιλεῖς Σίλβιοι ἐκαλοῦντο).

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 64^e, ‘Siluius Postumus ..., a quo omnes Albanorum reges Siluii uocati sunt’.

24

Romulus ... regnavit annos XXXVIII.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 182), ‘Romilos, Jahre 38’ = Syncellus 230.4–5, ἐβασίλευσε Ῥωμύλος ... ἔτη λη’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 88b, ‘regnat Romulus annos XXXVIII’.

∞ iuuenes de plebe Romana legit quos milites appellauit et centum seniores quos senatores dixit.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 182): ‘Romilos hub als erster aus dem Volke Männer zum Waffendienst aus, und machte hundert adelige Greise zu Sinklitikos’; und die nach diesen waren, nannte er Patrikier’ = Syncellus 230.14–15,

Ῥωμύλος πρῶτος ἐκ τοῦ δήμου ἐστράτευσεν ἄνδρας, συγκλητικούς τε ὁ γέροντας ἐποίησε καὶ πατρικίους ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκάλεσε = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 90^d, ‘Romulus primus milites sumpsit ex populo et nobilissimos centum senes ob aetatem senatores, ob similitudinem curae patres appellauit’ (addition from Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 6.6, ‘uel aetate uel curae similitudine patres appellabantur’).

Isidore, *Etym.* 9.3.32, ‘Miles dictus, quia mille erant ante in numero uno, uel quia unus est ex mille electus. Romulus autem primus ex populo milites sumpsit et appellauit’ (the last sentence derives from Jerome).

Isidore, *Etym.* 9.4.8, ‘Senatui nomen aetas dedit, quod seniores essent’.

Hic cum natat ad paludem caprae subito nusquam comparuit.

Liber de uir. ill. 2.13, ‘Cum ad Caprae paludem exercitum lustraret, nusquam comparuit.’

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 91^a, ‘Romulus apud paludem Caprae nusquam comparuit’.⁵ *Commentary.* See Chapter 6, pp. 111–12.

25

Titus Tatius dux Sabinorum una cum Romulo regnauit.

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 90^c, ‘Tatio Sabinorum rege regnante cum Romulo’.

26

Numa Pompilius regnauit annos XVI.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 183), ‘Numas Pomilios, Jahre 41’ = Syncellus 250.5, ἐβασίλευσε Νουμάς Πομπίλιος ἔτη μα’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 91a, ‘Numa Pompilius annos XLI’.

Hic duos menses ad X menses Romuli instituit, Ianuarium diis superis, Februarium diis inferis.

Liber de uir. ill. 3.1, ‘Annum in XII menses distribuit additis Ianuario et Februario.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 183), ‘Numas Pompilios fügte zwei Monate zum Jahre hinzu, den Junuarios und den Phebruarios; vorher nämlich war es ein zehnmönatiges genannt’ = Syncellus 250.8–10 = ὁ αὐτὸς τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ δύο μῆνας προσέθηκε, τὸν τε Ἰανουάριον καὶ τὸν Φεβρουάριον, δεκαμηνιαίου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ πρὸ τούτου χρηματίζοντος = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 91^c, ‘Numa Pompilius duos menses anno addidit, Ianuarium et Februarium, cum ante hoc decem tantum menses apud Romanos fuissent’.

Congiarium dedit scortinos asses.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 183), ‘Derselbe vergab auch das Gongiarion, Assaria, hölzerne und irdene Münzen’ = Syncellus, 250.10–11, ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ γογγιάριον ἔδωκεν ἀσσάρια ξύλινα καὶ σκύτινα καὶ ὀστράκινα = *Chron. pasch.* 218.16–17, Νουμμάς Πομπήλιος κογγιάριον ἔδωκεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀσσάρια

5 On this expression, see van der Vliet 1894.

ξύλινα καὶ ὀστράκινα = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 91^e, ‘Numa Pompilius ... congiarium dedit asses ligneos et scorteos’.

Commentary. See also the related Suda A 4126, s. v. ἄσσάκια, which mentions clay and leather (see Roberto 2005: 130 for this text and other parallels).

27

Tullius Hostilius regnavit annos XXII.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 184), ‘Tullos Silvas, Jahre 32’ = Syncellus 230.12, ἐβασίλευσε Τοῦλλος Ὀστίλιος ἔτη λβ’ ... Οὗτος καὶ Σίλβιος παρὰ τισι λέγεται = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 93a, ‘Tullus Hostilius annos XXXII’.

Chron. Scal. 302.20, ‘Tullius Seruilius annos XXXII’.

Commentary. One suspects that ‘Tullius Siluius’ lies behind the *Chron. Scal.*’s ‘Tullius Seruilius’.

28

Mancius Philippus regnavit annos XXXIII.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 185), ‘Ankos Markos, Jahre 23’ = Syncellus 283.26, ἐβασίλευσεν Ἄγκος Μάρκιος ἔτη κγ’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 96a, ‘Ancus Marcius annos XXIII’.

Ostiam coloniam condidit.

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 97^b, ‘Ancus Marcius ... Ostiam condidit’.

Liber de uir. ill. 5.3, ‘Ostiam coloniam ... deduxit.’

29

L. Tarquinius Priscus regnavit annos XXVIII.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 186), ‘Tarkinos Priskos, Jahre 37’ = Syncellus 283.28, ἐβασίλευσε Ταρκύνιος ἔτη λζ’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 97a, ‘Tarquinius Priscus annos XXXVII’.

Hic cum fundamenta Capitolii cauaret inuenit caput humanum litteris Tuscis scriptum, caput Oli regis, unde hodieque Capitolium appellatur.

Isidore, *Etym.* 15.2.31, ‘cum Tarquinius Priscus Capitolii fundamenta Romae aperiret, in loco fundamenti caput hominis litteris Tuscis notatum inuenit, et proinde Capitolium appellauit’.

Servius, *Comm. in Verg. Aen. libros* 8.345 (p. 251.4–5), ‘Quidam dicunt cum Capitolii, ubi nunc est, fundamenta iacerentur, caput humanum quod Oli diceretur inuentum’ (cf. also Arnobius, *Aduersus nationes* 6.7, pp. 314.18–15.19).

30

Seruilius Tullius ... regnavit annos XXV.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 187), ‘Serbios Tullos, Jahre 34’ = Syncellus 284.1–2, ἐβασίλευσε Σερούιος ὁ καὶ Σίλβιος Τοῦλλος ... ἔτη μδ’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 101a, ‘Seruius annos XXXIII’.

Seruius Tullius serua natus ...

Liber de uir. ill. 7.1, ‘Seruius Tullius ... captiuae filius ...’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (?) = Syncellus 284.1, Σερούτιος ... Τοῦλλος ὁ ἐκ δούλης

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 101^a, ‘Seruius ancillae ... filius’

31

Tarquinius Superbus regnavit annos XXV.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 182), ‘Tarkinos Siperbos, Jahre 35’ = Syncellus 284.3, ἐβασίλευσε Ταρκύνιος Σούπερβος ἔτη κδ’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 103a, ‘Tarquinius annos XXXV’.

Hic prior hominibus inuenit lautumias tormenta fustes metalla flagella carceres exilia. Ipse prior exilium meruit.

Isidore, *Etym.* 5.27.23, ‘Iste enim prior latomias tormenta fustes metalla atque exilia adinuenit, et ipse prior regibus exilium meruit’.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 189), ‘Tarkinos Siperbos erfand Banden, Geißeln, Pflöcke, Kerker, Gewahrsam, Fesseln, Halsringe, Ketten, die Außerlandungsverweisung, die Verurteilung zu den Erzgruben’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 103^c, ‘Tarquinius Superbus excogitauit uinclā taureas fustes lautumias carceres compedes catenas exilia metalla’ = Cedrenus, 262.1–2, ἐξεύρε δεσμά, μάστιγας, ξύλα, εἰρκτάς, φυλακάς, κλοιούς, πέδας, ἀλύσεις, ἐξορίας, μέταλλα καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο κακόν = John of Antioch, frag. 18 (Mariev, 26.12–13 = frag. 67.2 Roberto 2005: 134.4–6), δεσμά τε καὶ μάστιγας, κλοιοὺς ξυλίνους καὶ σιδηροὺς, πέδας, ἀλύσεις, μέταλλα καὶ ἐξορίας ἐφευρών (= Suda Σ 798).

Commentary. Only Isidore preserves the last sentence, including the characteristic *prior*.

35

Congiarium dedit X C.

Verbal parallels: *Fasti Ostienses s.a.* 20, p. 41, ‘Cong(iarium) d(iuisum)’; *s.a.* 37, p. 43, ‘k. Iun. cong(iarium) d(iuisum) X LXXV. XIII [k.] Aug. alteri X LXXV’; *s.a.* 84, p. 44, ‘[Domitianus congiarium diuisit] X LXXV’; 107, p. 47, ‘[Traianus ... co]ngiarium ded[it X ...]’; *s.a.* 145, p. 50, ‘Imp(erator) Antoninus Aug(ustus) congiar(ium) dedit X C’; *s.a.* 151, p. 51, ‘cong(iarium) dedit X [...]’.⁶ *HA Commodus* 16.8, ‘Congiarium dedit populo singulis X DCCXXV’; *HA Pertinax* 15.7, ‘Congiarium dedit populo X C’.

Occisus curia Pompeia.

Livy, *Periochae* 116, ‘in Pompeii curia occisus est’.

6 The ‘congiarium d.’ in the inscription for 20 and 37 could represent ‘congiarium d(atum) as well as congiarium d(iuisum)’, and since we have three examples of ‘dedit’ later in the inscription, it seems best to restore a form of ‘dare’ in these places as well. Degraffi reports an ‘I’ after the ‘D’ in 20, but it could just as well be an ‘E’ (Degraffi 1947:186–7). Vidman (1982: 41) reports no trace of a letter after the ‘D’.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 41 BC, 'Iulius Caesar ... in curia occiditur'.

Liber de uir. ill., 78.10, 'in curia ... occisus est.'

Jerome, *Chron. can.* 157^c, 'C. Iulius Caesar in curia occiditur'.

Commentary. The fourth-century epitomators do not cover Caesar; Eusebius notes only that he was killed.

36

Hoc imperante nauis Alexandrina primum in portu Romano introiuit nomine acatus, qui attulit frumenti modios CCCC, uectores ∞CC, <nautas CC,> piper, linteamen, carta, uitrea, et obeliscum cum sua sibi base, qui est in circo maximo, altum pedes LXXXVIIS.

Cedrenus 302.9–14, 'Ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Αὐγούστου Καίσαρος εἰσηλθε πλοῖον ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρείας εἰς τὴν πόρταν Ῥώμης, ἐπιφερόμενον σίτου μοδίων χιλιάδας υ', ἐπιβάτας ,ας', ναύτας σ', πέπερι, ὀθόνας, χάρτην, ὑέλια, καὶ τὸν μέγαν ὀβελίσκον μετὰ τῆς βάσεως (*Frick 1892: 115 n. 2: τοῦ βασιλέως ms*), αὐτόν τε ἐστῶτα ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ ἵππικῳ, ἔχοντα ὕψος πόδας πζ' ἡμισυν.

Excessit Nola.

Verbal parallels: *Fasti Ostienses* s.a. 37, p. 43, 'Ti(berius) Caesar Misen[i] excessit'; *Descriptio consulum* s.a. 96, 'Excessit Domitianus in Palatio Romae'.

Series regum 154.20, 'Augustos starb zu Nola.'

Aur. Victor 1.2, 'morbo Nolae consumptus' = *Epit. de caes.* 1.26, 'Nolae morbo interiit'.

KG = Eutropius 7.8.4, 'obiit ... morte communi in oppido Campaniae Atella' = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 171^d, 'Atellae in Campania moritur'.

Commentary. Here we see the first instance of the agreement of the *Breviarium* with the *Series regum*. The KG had the incorrect Atella, but Aurelius Victor (whence the *Epit. de caes.*) had another source that provided, or he himself knew, the correct location. Eusebius did not know it.

37

Excessit Miseno.

Verbal parallel: *Fasti Ostienses* s.a. 37, p. 43, 'Ti(berius) Caesar Misen[i] excessit.'

Series regum 154.21, 'Tiberius starb in Mysen.'

KG = Eutropius 7.11.3, 'mortuus est in Campania' = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 177^b, 'Tiberius in Campania moritur'.

Commentary. Neither the KG tradition nor Eusebius shows any awareness of where Tiberius died (the *Chron. pasch.* says that he died a natural death in Rome, 431.11–12). Again the *Breviarium* agrees with the *Series regum*.

38

Occisus palatio.

Series regum 154.22, 'Gaios Kaisr wurde getötet im Palaste.'

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* = *Chron. pasch.* 432.19–20/*Anon. matr.* 47.18–19, Γάιος ... ἐσφάγη ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ (Ῥώμης *add. CP*) = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 178ⁱ, ‘Gaius ... occiditur in palatio’.

KG = Eutropius 7.12.4, ‘interfectus in Palatio’.

Commentary. The *Series regum* has no entry for Gaius, because it was shifted to the head of the list when a scribe mistook this Gaius for Gaius Julius Caesar. This is the entry for the latter.

39

Tiberius Claudius ... excessit palatio.

Series regum 154.23, ‘Tiberios Klaudios starb im Palaste.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* = *Chron.* 724, 90.22, ‘Claudius mortuus est in Palatio’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 181^e, ‘Claudius moritur in Palatio’.

40

Nero occisus uia Patinaria.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 216), ‘Nero legte ... in irgend einem Garten Hand an sich selbst’ = *Anon. matr.* 48.6–7, Νέρων φυγὼν εἰς τὸ Ἄργος ἑαυτὸν χειροσάμενος τέθνηκε = Syncellus 414.16–18, εἰς Ἄργος φύγει ... ἑαυτὸν διαχειροσάμενος τέθνηκεν.

KG = Eutropius 7.15.1, ‘in suburbano liberti sui, quod est inter Salariam et Nomentanam uiam ad quartum urbis miliarium, se interfecit’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 185^h, ‘Nero ... fugiens ad quartum urbis miliarium in suburbano liberti sui inter Salariam et Nomentanam uiam semet interficit’ (= Suetonius, *Nero*, 48.1, 49.3–4, ‘offerente Phaonte liberto suburbanum suum inter Salariam et Nomentanam uiam circa quartum miliarium ... ferrum iugulo adegit iuuante Epaphrodito ... defecit’).

Commentary. This is the first of only two instances where the compiler of the *Breviarium* has included the emperor’s name in the final statement. The other is § 61 for Alexander. Normally he does not include a name unless he needs to distinguish between two emperors in one entry (70, 79, 80).

The Armenian translation shows that Nero did not flee to Argos, so the original Greek must have been something like εἰς ἀργούς, ‘to the country’. Helm suggests εἰς τι ἀργίδιον to match the Armenian (1984: 405), but that does not explain the Greek witnesses. Only the Latin tradition (from Suetonius) seems to know the exact details about the location of Phaon’s villa, but the Via Patinaria is attested in the appendices to the regionary catalogues and so it may indeed have been the road that linked the Viae Salaria and Nomentana, and on which the villa was actually situated (Richardson 1992: 418). This is generally accepted in modern scholarship, although the extremely specific yet still quite wrong location for Severus’ death (§ 81) suggests caution.

41

Decollatus foro Romano iacuit.

Series regum 154.25, ‘Galbas wurde getötet in Rom.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 216), ‘Galbas ... ward inmitten des Marktplatzes in der Stadt Rom enthauptet’ = *Chron. pasch.* 459.18–20, Γάλβας ... ἐν μέσῃ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἀγορᾷ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετμήθη = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 186^e, ‘Galba ... in medio Romanae urbis foro capite truncatur.’

KG = Aur. Victor 6.2–3, ‘accensas cohortes armatasque in forum deduxerat. Quo ... ad lacum Curtium caesus est ...’ = Eutropius 7.16.3, ‘iugulatus in foro Romae’ = *Epit. de caes.* 6.4, ‘ad lacum Curtium caesus est’ (= Suetonius, *Galba*, 19.2, 20.2, ‘in Forum usque processit ... Iugulatus est ad lacum Curti ac relictus ita uti erat, donec gregarius miles ... caput ei amputavit’).

Commentary. Both the *KG* and Eusebius know the exact location of Galba’s death, but only the *Breviarium* and the Greek traditions know that he was decapitated. Although it is noted by Suetonius, it seems not to have been mentioned in the *KG*. This is one of the four instances where the *Breviarium* does not agree with the *Series regum*, which does not mention the Forum.

42

Ipse se Brixellis interfecit.

Series regum 154.26, ‘Othon tötete sich selbst.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 216), ‘Bitelios (= Othon) ... legte Hand an sich’ = *Chron. pasch.* 460.1/Symeon the Logothete 56.2, ἐαυτῷ (ἐαυτὸν *SL*) διεχειρίσατο = *Anon. matr.* 48.8, ἐαυτὸν ἀνείλε = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 186^e, ‘Otho ... propria manu occubuit’.

KG = Eutropius 7.17.4, ‘apud Betriacum ... semet occidit’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 186^e, ‘Otho ... apud Betriacum propria manu occubuit’ = *Epit. de caes.* 7.2, ‘apud Betriacum uictus semet gladio transfixit’ (= Suetonius, *Otho*, 9.2, 11.2, ‘apud Betriacum ... superatus est ... uno se traiecit ictu ... exanimatus est’).

Commentary. Only the *Breviarium* can provide the correct location of Otho’s suicide (though for some reason it is written as a plural). It is interesting to note that the *Series regum* agrees with Eusebius in omitting the location. The *KG* has confused the location of Otho’s final battle with that of his death. This is a frequent narrative compression, of which we shall see many instances in the following analysis. Historians often either simply assume that defeat or deposition and death occurred in the same place or for ease of narrative flow identify the location of an emperor’s defeat in battle with the location of his death.

43

Occisus palatio.

Series regum 154.27, ‘Vitellios wurde getötet im Palaste.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 216), ‘Othon (= Bitelios) ... ward ermordet im Palation zu Rom’ = *Chron. pasch.* 460.2, ἐσφάγη ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ Ῥώμης.

KG = Aur. Victor 8.6, ‘iniecto laqueo ... ad scalas Gemonias perque eas pertractus; simul ictibus ... confosso corpore in Tiberim deicitur’ = Eutropius 7.18.5, ‘tractus per urbem Romam ... iugulatus et in Tiberim deiectus’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 186^e, ‘Vitellius ... occisus in Tiberim proicitur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 8.4, ‘per scalas Gemonias trahitur ... Numerosis ictibus confossus interiit’ (= Suetonius, *Vitellius*,

16, 17, ‘referri se in Palatium passus est ... ab his extractus ... in Forum tractus ... apud Gemonias minutissimis ictibus excarnificatus atque confectus est et inde unco tractus in Tiberim’).

Commentary. Here the *Breviarium* aligns itself with the incorrect tradition reported by the *Series regum* and Eusebius that Vitellius was killed in the palace, which is where he was arrested and deposed (for such narrative compression, see § 42). Such an agreement in error strongly reinforces the close connection among the *Breviarium*, *Series regum*, and Eusebius.

44

Excessit Curibus Sabinis.

Series regum 154.28, ‘Vespianos verschied in den Salustianischen Gärten’.

KG = Eutropius 7.20.2, ‘extinctus est in uilla propria circa Sabinos’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 188ⁱ, ‘Vespasianus ... mortuus est ... in uilla propria circa Sabinos’ (see § 45; cf. Suetonius, *Vespasianus* 24, ‘Cutilias ac Reatina rura ... petit ... extinctus est’).

Commentary. As was the case with Otho, the *Breviarium* is more detailed than any other tradition with regard to the name of the town, though the *KG* provides the detail about the villa that is not found in the other texts. The notice in the *Series regum* was miscopied from Nerva.

45

Excessit Curibus Sabinis cubiculo patris.

Series regum 154.29, ‘Titos verschied im Palaste’.

KG = Eutropius 7.22.1, ‘morbo periit in ea qua pater uilla’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 189^e, ‘Titus morbo perit in ea uilla qua pater’ = *Epit. de caes.* 10.15, ‘in eodem quo pater apud Sabinos agro febri interiit’ (= Suetonius, *Titus* 10.1, 11.1, ‘Sabinos petit ... Excessit in eadem qua pater uilla’).

Commentary. Again the *Breviarium* is more accurate than any other tradition, while emphasizing the same point found in the tradition of the *KG*, but specifying it even more, noting that Titus died not just in the same villa, but in the same bedroom. It would seem that in this parallel the *Breviarium* and Suetonius/the *KG* each independently reflects part of the official notice of Titus’ death, which must have specifically noted where he died. The *Series regum* is inexplicably incorrect.

46

Multae operae publicae fabricatae sunt: atria VII, horrea piperataria ubi modo est basilica Constantiniana et horrea Vespasiani, templum Castorum et Mineruae, portam Capenam, gentem Flauiam, Diuorum, Iseum et Serapeum, Mineruam chalcidicam, odeum, Minuciam ueterem, stadium, et thermas Titianas et Traianas, amphitheatrum usque ad clypea, templum Vespasiani et Titi, Capitolium, senatum, ludos IIII, palatium, metam sudantem, et pantheum.

KG? = Eutropius 7.23.5, ‘Romae quoque multa opera fecit, in his Capitolium et Forum Transitorium, Diuorum porticus, Isium ac Serapium et stadium’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 191^a, ‘Multa opera Romae facta, in quis Capitolium, forum transito-

rium, diuorum porticus, Isium ac Sarapium, stadium, horrea piperataria, Vespasiani templum, Minerua Chalcidica, Odium, forum Traiani, thermae Traianae et Titianae, senatus, ludus matutinus, mica aurea, meta sudans et Pantheum' (cf. Suetonius, *Domitianus* 5, 'Capitolium ... Nouam ... aedem in Capitolio Custodi Ioui et forum quod nunc Neruae uocatur, item Flauiae templum gentis et stadium et odium et naumachiam').

Occisus palatio.

Verbal parallel: *Fasti Ostienses s.a.* 96, p. 45, 'Domitianus occisus.'

Series regum 154.30, 'Dometianos wurde getötet.'

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 218), 'Dometianos ward getötet im Palation' = *Chron.* 724, 93.29, 'Domitianus occisus est in palatio' = Ps-Dionysius 91.17, 'occisus est Domitianus in palatio' = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 192^e, 'Domitianus occisus in Palatio'.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 96, 'Excessit Domitianus in palatio Romae'.

Eutropius 7.23.6, 'interfectus est ... in Palatio' (cf. Suetonius, *Domitianus* 16.2, 'in cubiculum se recepit atque ibi occisus est').

Commentary. All traditions except the *Series regum* know that Domitian died in the palace and all but the *Descriptio* know that he was assassinated.

47

Excessit hortis Salustianis.

Series regum 155.1, 'Nervas verschied in dem Salustianischen Gärten.'

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 218), 'Nervas schied hin durch Krankheit, in den salustianischen Gärten' = Syncellus 423.3–4/*Anon. matr.* 12–13, Νερῶος ... νόσῳ τελευτᾷ ἐν κήποις Σαλουστιανοῖς = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 193^d, 'Nerua morbo perit in hortis Sallustianis'.

Eutropius 8.1.2, 'mortuus est Romae'.

Commentary. The *Breviarium* again clearly mirrors the details found in the *Series regum* and Eusebius.

48

Excessit Selinunti.

Series regum 155.2, 'Traianos verschied in Selinunt.'

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 219), 'Traianos schied durch Krankheit hin' = Ps-Dionysius 92.24, 'Traianus morbo mortuus est Selinunte' = Syncellus 425.13, Τραιανὸς νόσῳ τελευτᾷ ... ἐν Σελινούντι = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 197^a, 'Traianus morbo in Selenunti perit'.

KG = Eutropius 8.5.2, 'apud Seleuciam Isauriae ... extinctus est' (whence Syncellus 425.13–14, κατὰ δὲ ἄλλους ἐν Σελευκείᾳ τῆς Ἰσαυρίας) = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 197^a, 'siue, ut alibi scriptum repperimus, apud Seleuciam Isauriae ... extinctus est'.

Commentary. The *Breviarium* again clearly mirrors the Greek tradition; the *KG* is wrong for the third time.

49

Templum Romae et Veneris fabricatum est.

KG? = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 200^d, ‘Templum Romae et Veneris sub Hadriano in urbe factum’.

Excessit Bais Veteribus.

Series regum 155.3, ‘Adrianos verschied wassersüchtig, ruhrbefallen.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 221), ‘Adrianos verstarb, einer tödlichen Wassersucht verfallen, in Baies’ = Syncellus 427.23/*Anon. matr.* 50.10–11, Ἀδριανὸς ὕδρωπι (ὕδρόπω *AM*) τελευτᾷ ἐν Βαΐαις τῆς Ἰταλίας = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 201^f, ‘Hadrianus morbo intercutis aquae apud Baias moritur’.

Aur. Victor 14.12, ‘apud Baias tabe interiit.’

Eutropius 8.7.3, ‘obiit in Campania’.

HA Hadrian 25.6, ‘apud ... Baias ... periit’.

Commentary. The *Breviarium* is again slightly more detailed with regard to the name than the other traditions, which are otherwise in agreement.

50

Excessit Lorio.

Series regum 155.4, ‘Antoninos Eusebes verschied zu Silorios.’

KG = Eutropius 8.8.4, ‘obiit apud Lorium uillam suam miliario ab urbe duodecimo’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 204^a, ‘Antoninus Pius apud Lorium uillam suam XII ab urbe miliario moritur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 15.7, ‘apud Lorios uilla propria milibus passuum duodecim ab urbe febris ... consumptus est’.

HA Antoninus Pius 12.6, ‘spiritum reddidit apud Lorium’.

Commentary. With the exception of Eusebius, who says nothing (though there are very few witnesses to this entry), all the traditions know the location of Pius’ death, which is interesting in itself. It must have been part of the official announcement of his death.

51

Excessit Altino.

Series regum 155.5, ‘Beros verschied zu Latinos (= Altinum).’

HA Verus 9.11, ‘non longe ab Altino ... morbo ... correptus ... Altinum perductus ... apud Altinum periit’.

KG = Eutropius 8.10.3, ‘obiit ... in Venetia, cum a Concordia ciuitate Altinum proficisceretur’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 205^k, ‘Lucius ... inter Concordiam et Altinum ... extinctus est’ = *Epit. de caes.* 16.5, ‘inter Altinum atque Concordiam ... exstinctus est.’

Commentary. The *Breviarium* agrees with the *Series regum* and the *HA* in placing Verus’ death in Altinum, while the *KG*, which probably derives from the same source as the *HA* (Marius Maximus), places his death at the location of his stroke (for such narrative compression, see § 42). Eusebius is not only unaware of the location, he also gets the length of his reign quite wrong (see Chapter 5, pp. 57–8).

52

Instrumenta debitorum fisco in foro Romano arserunt per dies XXX.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 218, ‘instrumenta debitorum fisco in foro Romano arserunt per dies XXX’.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 223), ‘die <Schuldverschreibungs>-Urkunden verbrannten sie auf dem Romanesia-Markte’ = Syncellus 432.9–10, τοὺς τῶν χρεῶν χάρτας ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμανισίας ἀγορᾶς κατέφλεξαν = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 207^f, ‘tabulas debitorum in medio Romanae urbis foro incendi praeeperunt’ (cf. Dio 71.32.2, πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν (sc. τοῖς ὀφείλουσί τι τῷ βασιλικῷ καὶ τῷ δημοσίῳ πᾶσι πάντα τὰ ὀφειλόμενα) γράμματα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καυθῆναι ἐκέλευσε).

Commentary. As can be seen, the *Descriptio* assigns this entry to 218, but the exact parallel with the *Breviarium* and the fame of the actions of Marcus Aurelius in 178, as evidenced by the references to them in Eusebius and Cassius Dio, strongly urge the conclusion that we are dealing with a misplaced entry, not a duplicate event. There are, after all, very few entries in this section of the *Descriptio*. Duncan-Jones is inclined to accept the authenticity of the date, however (1994: 62, with 59–60).

Excessit Pannonia Superiore.

Series regum 155.6, ‘Markos Antoninos verschied in Pannonia.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 223), ‘Antoninos starb durch Entzündungssiechtum in Panonia’ = Syncellus 432.12, Ἀντωνίνος ἐν Παννονίᾳ ... νόσῳ τελευτᾷ = *Chron. pasch.* 489.12–13, Ἀντωνίνος ... νοσήσας ἀπέθανεν ἐν Πανωνίᾳ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 208^d, ‘Antoninus in Pannonia morbo perit’.

KG (?) = Aur. Victor 16.13, ‘Vendobonae interiit’ = *Epit. de caes.* 16.12, ‘apud Bendobonam morbo consumptus est’.

Commentary. Modern scholarship accepts that Aurelius died in Sirmium on the basis of Tertullian (*Apolog.* 25.5, ‘M. Aurelio apud Sirmium rei publicae exempto’), who was writing earlier than Aurelius Victor (there is no evidence that Marius Maximus, and hence the *KG*, mentioned the location of his death), and although both Vindobona (Vienna) and Sirmium are in Pannonia, only Sirmium is in Pannonia Superior. As a result, although the *Breviarium* is here unusually vague in missing the name of the city, it is accurate. Its statement is more detailed than the *Series regum* and Eusebius, but it does still agree with them against the Latin traditions in that it gives the name of the province rather than that of the city.

53

Excessit domo Victiliana.

Series regum 155.7, ‘Komodos wurde begraben im Palaste des Vitelios.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 223), ‘Komodos verendete unvermutet, erstickt im Palaste des Bestilianos’ = *Chron. pasch.* 492.14, Κόμμοδος αἰφνίδιον ἐτελεύτησεν ἀποπνιγείς ἐν οἰκίᾳ Βεστιανοῦ = *Anon. matr.* 51.8–9, Κώμωδος αἰφνίδιος ἐτελεύτησεν ἀποπνιγείς ἐν οἰκίᾳ Βεστιλιανοῦ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 210^a, ‘Commodus strangulatur in domo Vestiliani’.

HA Pertinax 5.7, ‘Commodus in Vectilianis occisus est’.

Commentary. Once again the *Breviarium* agrees with, but is more accurate than, the other traditions, apart from the *HA*. The Domus Vectiliana (not ‘Vectiliani’) appears in the regionary catalogues in Regio II (see Richardson 1992 : 140) and the *HA* says that Commodus moved there (‘Vectilianaes aedes’) because he could not sleep in the palace (*Commodus* 16.3). The *KG* said nothing. The name has become corrupted in the *Series regum* and Eusebius.

54

Excessit palatio.

Series regum 155.8, ‘Pertinax wurde getötet im Palaste.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 223), ‘Pertinax ward getötet im Palation’ = *Chron.* 724, 97.8, ‘Pertinax occisus est in palatio’ = *Anon. matr.* 51.10–11, Πέρτιναξ ... ἐσφάγη ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 210^e, ‘Pertinax occiditur in Palatio’.

HA Pertinax 11.1, 4, 6, 8, 10, ‘ad imperatorias aedes ... in Palatium ... porticus Palatii ... ad interiora ... a ceteris confossus est’.

Commentary. The *KG* appears to have been silent on the location of Pertinax’s death.

55

Occisus palatio.

Series regum 155.9, ‘Julianos wurde getötet im Palaste.’

HA Julian 8.8, ‘in Palatio ... occisus est’.

KG = Aur. Victor 19.4, ‘apud palatium Romae obtruncare’ = Eutropius 8.17, ‘interfectus in Palatio’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 210^e, ‘... quem postea Seuerus apud Muluium pontem interfecit’.

Epit. de caes. 19.3, ‘in abditas palatii balneas ductus ... decollatur’.

Commentary. All traditions agree, though the *Epit. de caes.* has details no other source here reports. Eusebius missed Didius Julianus somehow, and as a result much of the Greek tradition omits him as well (see Chapter 5). Jerome here has erroneously compressed his source (for such narrative compression, see § 42): cf. his ‘quem postea Seuerus apud Muluium pontem interfecit’ with Eutropius’ ‘uictus est a Seuero apud Muluium pontem, interfectus in Palatio’.

56

Hoc imperante Septizonium et thermae Seuerianae dedicatae sunt.

KG? = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 212^a, ‘Seuero imperante thermae Seuerianae ... Romae factae et Septizonium extructum’ = *HA Severus* 19.5, ‘Opera publica praecipua eius exstant Septizonium et thermae Seuerianae’.

Commentary. Note the similarity between ‘Hoc imperante’ and ‘Seuero imperante’.

Excessit Britanniae.

Series regum 155.10, ‘Seberos verschied zu Eburakos.’

KG = Aur. Victor 20.27, ‘in Britanniae municipio, cui Eboraci nomen ... morbo extinctus est’ = Eutropius 8.19.2, ‘decessit Eboraci’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 213^a, ‘Seuerus moritur Eburaci in Britannia’.

HA Severus 19.1, ‘Periit Eboraci in Britannia’.

Commentary. Another rare instance where the *Breviarium* is less specific than the other traditions, especially the *Series regum*, though it is still correct. Oddly, Eusebius said only that Severus died ἐν τῷ βαρβαρικῷ (Karst, 224; *Chron.* 724, 97.14; Ps-Dionysius 98.1–2; *Chron. pasch.* 497.14–15).

57

Occisus palatio.

HA Caracalla 2.4, ‘(Caracalla) fratrem in Palatio fecit occidi’.

Commentary. Few texts even mention Geta, let alone any details concerning his death, but again the *Breviarium* is correct.

58

Thermae Antoninianae dedicatae sunt.

KG? = Eutropius 8.20.1, ‘opus Romae egregium fecit lauacri, quae Antoniniana appellatur’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 213^e, ‘Antoninus Romae thermas sui nominis aedificauit’.

Excessit inter Edissam et Carras.

Series regum 155.11–12, ‘Antoninus Pisak <wurde getötet> zwischen Charan und Urha.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* = *Anon. matr.* 52.1–2, Ἀντωνίνος ... ἐσφάγη μεταξὺ Βαίων καὶ Ἐδέσσης = *Chron. pasch.* 498.9, ἐσφάγη μέσον Ἐδέσσης καὶ Καρρῶν = Syncellus 436.13–14, ἀναιρεῖται ... πρὸς Καρίαις καὶ Ἐδέσση = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 213^g, ‘Antoninus interficitur inter Edessam et Carras’.

KG = Aur. Victor 21.5, ‘apud Edessam ... moritur’ = Eutropius 8.20.2, ‘defunctus est in Osdroena apud Edessam’.

Epit. de caes. 21.6, ‘Cum Carras iter faceret, apud Edessam ... interfectus est’.

HA Caracalla 7.1, ‘Occisus est ... in medio itinere inter Carrhas et Edessam’.

Commentary. There is a remarkably consistent tradition about the location of Caracalla’s death in both Latin and Greek, except for the *KG*, which gets both the location and the mode of his death incorrect (he was assassinated at the side of the road while emptying his bladder). The *Epit. de caes.* repeats the *KG*’s error of the location, but correctly notes that he was assassinated and mentions the journey from Carrhae, so another source must be involved.

59

Amphitheater arsit (see also §§ 52, 73, 78, 82).

Verbal parallels: *Fasti Ostienses s.a.* 36, p. 42, ‘Pars Circi inter uiatores arsit’; *s.a.* 38, p. 43, ‘Aemiliana arserunt’; *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* 637 (*s.a.* 488; Mommsen 1892: 312), ‘arsit pons Apolinaris noctu in pascha XV kald. Maias’; *HA Antoninus Pius* 9.2, ‘Carthaginiense forum arsit’.

Occisus Arcelaide.

Series regum 155.13, ‘Makrinos wurde getötet zu Archelaid.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 224), ‘Makrinos ward getötet zu Archelaid’ = Syncellus 436.23/*Chron. pasch.* 498.12/*Anon. matr.* 52.4, Μακρίνος ἐσφάγη ἐν Ἀρχελαΐδῃ (ἐν *om. AM*) = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 214^d, ‘Macrinus occiditur in Archelaide’.

HA Macrinus 10.3, ‘in uico quodam Bithyniae occisus est’.

Commentary. Again the *Breviarium* aligns itself with the *Series regum* and Eusebius. The *KG* knew nothing about the location.

60

Eliogaballium dedicatum est.

KG? = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 214^e, ‘Heliogabalum templum Romae aedificatum’.

Occisus Romae.

Series regum 155.14, ‘Antoninos Eliogabalos wurde getötet zu Rom.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 224), ‘Antoninos ward getötet zu Rom’ = *Chron. pasch.* 499.9–10, ἐσφάγη Ἀντωνίνος ... ἐν Ῥώμῃ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 214ⁱ, ‘Antoninus Romae occiditur’.

KG = Aur. Victor 23.3, ‘in castris praetoriis ... oppressus est’ = Eutropius 8.22, ‘tumultu interfectus est militari’ = *Epit. de caes.* 23.5, ‘Ipse tumultu militari interfectus est’.

HA Elagabalus 17.1–2, ‘in latrina ... occisus. Tractus deinde per publicum ... (cadauer) in Tiberim abiectum est’ = *Epit. de caes.* 23.6, ‘Huius corpus per urbis uias ... tractum ... usque ad Tiberim deductum ... in fluuium proiectum est’.

Commentary. Again the *Breviarium* mirrors the *Series regum* and Eusebius, but the *HA* and the *Epit de caes.*, both relying on a common (Greek?) source here provide the details that are missing from the other traditions. The *KG* seems to have said nothing, and Victor must have guessed about the praetorian camp from the ‘tumultu militari’ he found in the *KG*. Ps-Dionysius (99.5) says that Elagabalus was killed ‘in foro romano’. This should be from Eusebius, but Eusebius said nothing of the sort.

61

Thermae Alexandrinae dedicatae sunt.

KG? = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 215^d, ‘Thermae Alexandrinae Romae aedificatae’.

Alexander occisus Mogontiaco.

Series regum 155.15, ‘Alexandros wurde getötet zu Mogentiaikon.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 225), ‘Alexandros ward getötet zu Mogontiaikon’ = *Chron. pasch.* 500.11–13, ἐσφάγη ... Ἀλέξανδρος ... ἐν Μογοντιακῷ = Syncellus 439.7–9, Ἀλέξανδρος ... ἀναιρεῖται ... ἐν Μογοντιακῷ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 216^c, ‘Alexander occiditur Mogontiaci’.

Aur. Victor 24.4, ‘uico Britanniae, cui uocabulum Sicilia, trucidauere.’

Eutropius 8.23, ‘periit in Gallia’.

HA Severus Alexander 59.6, ‘eum ... in Britannia, ut alii uolunt in Gallia, in uico cui Sicilia nomen est ... occiderunt’.

Commentary. The *Breviarium* again provides the name of the city that is only found in the *Series regum* and Eusebius. The Latin traditions are completely confused.

62

Magna pugna fuit cum Romanis et praetorianis.

Verbal parallels: *Descriptio consulum s.a.* 350.5, ‘pugna magna fuit cum Romanis et Magnentianis’; *s.a.* 378.3, ‘pugna magna fuit cum Romanis et Gothis’.

Occisus Aquileia.

Series regum 155.16, ‘Maximinos wurde getötet zu Akileia.’

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 225), ‘Maximinos ward getötet zu Akileia’ = Syncellus 442.11/*Anon. matr.* 52.11–12, Μαξιμίνος ... ἀνῆρέθη ... ἐν Ἀκυλῖᾳ (Ἀκυλλίᾳ AM) = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 216^g, ‘Maximinus Aquileiae ... occiditur’.

KG = Aur. Victor 27.4, ‘Eos Pupienus Aquileiae obsidione confecit’ = Eutropius 9.1, ‘a Pupieno Aquileiae occisus est’ = *Epit. de caes.* 25.2, ‘apud Aquileiam ... discerptus est’.

HA Duo Maximini 22.1, 23.6, ‘cum ... obsideret Aquileiam Maximinus ... milites ... Maximinum et filium ... occiderunt’.

63

Excesserunt Africae.

Series regum 155.17, ‘Gordianos erdrosselte sich selbst in Aphrike.’

HA Tres Gordiani 15.3, ‘Gordianus iunior ... in eodem bello interficitur’; 16.3, ‘senior Gordianus ... in Africa ... laqueo uitam finiuit’ (cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 26.6.20, ‘uitam laqueo ... profundit’); 34.1, ‘duobus in Africa interemptis’.

Commentary. The KG made no mention of Gordian II, and even Gordian I is little more than a cipher: though Eutropius can at least note that he was *proconsul Africae* (9.1.1) and the parallel between Ammianus (who likewise only knows of two Gordians) and the HA suggests that the KG agreed with the *Series regum* in attributing his death to hanging. Like these witnesses, the *Series regum* knows only of a single Gordian in Africa, which would suggest that its origins are Latin, rather than Greek, yet the *Breviarium* knows of both, as does the HA, whose details derive from Greek sources. The *Breviarium* also knows how long they reigned, information that only appears in later Greek sources, as we saw in Chapter 5. The only other Latin text that knows of two Gordians in Africa is the *Laterculus* of Polemius Silvius, written in Gaul in 449, in spite of the fact that, as I have argued elsewhere (Burgess 1993: 492–4), it otherwise seems to derive mainly from the KG. It says, ‘Duo Gordiani (Gorgianus *ms*) in Africa tyranni fuerunt’ (Mommsen 1892: 521). As was the case with Didius Julianus, Eusebius takes no notice of either Gordian, no doubt considering them ephemeral usurpers.

Gordian II was killed in battle and Gordian I hanged himself, so the *Breviarium* should say ‘occisi’ instead of ‘excesserunt’, which implies death by natural causes. It would seem he did not know how they died.

64

Occisi Romae.

Series regum 155.18, ‘Pupinios und Balbinios <wurden> getö<tet>.’

Aur. Victor 27.6, ‘Clodio Caecilioque Romae intra palatium caesis’ = Eutropius 9.2.2, ‘Balbinus et Pupienus in Palatio interfecti sunt’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 216ⁱ, ‘Pupienus et Albinus ... in Palatio occisi’.

HA Maximus et Balbinus 14.5–7, ‘milites ... ambos eos nudatos uestibus regalibus de palatio ... produxerunt et per mediam ciuitatem ad castra raptare uoluerunt ... sed ... ambos occiderunt et in itinere medio reliquerunt’.

Commentary. The *HA* has its details from Greek sources, while the *KG* is relying on Latin traditions and has substituted the place of their deposition and arrest for the location of their assassination (for such narrative compression, see § 42). The *Breviarium* does not mention the palace and so seems to be following the version found in the *HA*. Eusebius does not mention either Balbinus or Pupienus (the references to them in *Chron. can.* 216^{g,i} were added by Jerome).

65

Excessit finibus Partiae.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 225), ‘Gordianos ward getötet in Parthia’ = *Chron.* 724, 97.35–6, ‘occisus est in Parthia’ = Ps-Dionysius 100.7, ‘occisus est Gordianus apud Parthos’.

KG = Eutropius 9.2.3, ‘Parthis bellum intulit ... rediens haud longe a Romanis finibus interfectus est’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 217^a, ‘Gordianus ... Parthorum natione superata ... haut longe a Romano solo interfectus est’.

Epit. de caes. 27.2, ‘Apud Ctesiphontem ... occiditur’.

HA Tres Gordiani 34.1, 2, ‘tertio (Gordiano) in Persidis finibus (interempto) ... sepulchrum milites apud Circesium castrum fecerunt in finibus Persidis’.

Commentary. We now lose the valuable witness of the *Series regum* and have to rely on the evidence of Eusebius’ *Chronici canones* alone. The *Breviarium* would seem to be mirroring the wording of the *KG/HA* traditions.

66

Occisus senior Verona, iunior Romae in castris praetoriis.

KG = Aur. Victor 28.10–11, ‘Philippus ... Veronae cadit ..., Romae ... apud castra praetoria filius interficitur’ = Eutropius 9.3, ‘Ambo ... interfecti sunt, senior Philippus Veronae, Romae iunior’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 218^b, ‘Philippus senior Veronae, Romae iunior occiditur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 28.2–3, ‘Veronae ... interfectus est ... Filius autem eius ... Romae occiditur’.

Commentary. There can be no question that the *Breviarium*’s source is related to the *KG*’s. Eusebius says nothing about the location.

67

Occisus praetorio Abrypto.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 226), ‘Dekos ward mitsamt seinem Sohne zu Abritos getötet = *Chron. pasch.* 505.5–6, ἐσφάγη μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ... ἐν Ἀβρύτῳ = *Anon. matr.* 53.14, Δέκιος ἅμα τῷ παιδί ἐν Ἀβρύτῳ ἐσφάγη = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 218^h, ‘Decius cum filio in Abryto occiditur’.

KG = Aur. Victor 29.4, ‘<A>bruti fraude cecidere ...’ = Eutropius 9.4, ‘uterque in barbarico interfecti sunt’ = *Epit. de caes.* 29.3, ‘In solo barbarico inter confusas turbas gurgite paludis submersus est’.

Commentary. The name of the city is generally spelled Abritus/Ἀβριττος, and the common variant spelling among all these texts (the Greek upsilon is transliterated as an ‘i’ in Armenian) suggests that they all derive ultimately from a single source, perhaps the original announcement of Decius’ defeat and death. It also appeared in Dexippus’ now-lost account of Decius’ defeat (= Syncellus, p. 459.11).

Aurelius Victor knows the correct name, but it does not appear in Eutropius or the *Epit. de caes.*, which suggests that the *KG* may have had something like ‘Abryti in barbarico’. It seems unlikely that Victor would have had knowledge of Decius’ obscure death-place independent of the *KG*. The *Breviarium* provides an additional detail not found in any other source for the exact location of Decius’ death. Some Greek sources like Zosimus and Zonaras mention the swamp noted by the *Epit. de caes.*, but there are other Greek sources, such as Malalas (12.XVIIe; Thurn, 227 = *Chron. pasch.* 505.4–6), who state that Decius was assassinated by one of his prefects at Abritus, which could easily have taken place inside the camp praetorium.

68

Magna mortalitas fuit.

Verbal parallels: *Excerpta Sangallensia* 599, *s.a.* 467, ‘Fuit boum nimia mortalitas’; 702, *s.a.* 542, ‘Fuit nimia mortalitas in homines ex uulneribus’; 715, *s.a.* 570, ‘Fuit hominum et boum nimia mortalitas’; and 718, *s.a.* 572, ‘Fuit hominum nimia mortalitas’.

Occisi in Foro Flamini.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 226), ‘Gallos und Volosianos wurden getötet auf dem Marktplatze des Phlaminios’ = Ps-Dionysius 108.31–2, ‘occisi sunt Gallus et Volusianus in foro Flamini’ = Syncellus 459.16–17, ἐσφάγησαν ... ἐν ἀγορῇ Φλαμινίου = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 219^f, ‘Gallus et Volusianus ... in foro Flamini ... interfecti sunt’.

KG = Aur. Victor 31.2, ‘Interamnae ab suis caeduntur’ = Eutropius 9.5, ‘Interamnae interfecti sunt’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 219^f, ‘Gallus et Volusianus ... in foro Flamini siue, ut alii putant, Interamnae interfecti sunt’ = *Epit. de caes.* 31.1, ‘apud Interamnam ... caeduntur’.

Commentary. The use of a common tradition by the compiler of the *Breviarium* and Eusebius is again obvious here. Narrative compression in the *KG* has put their deaths in the location of their defeat (for such compression, see § 42).

69

Occisus ponte Sanguinario.

KG = Aur. Victor 31.3, ‘morbo absumptus est’ = Eutropius 9.6, ‘extinctus est’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 219^g, ‘Aemilianus ... extinctus’.

Epit. de caes. 31.2, ‘Aemilianus ... dominatus apud Spoletium, siue pontem, quem ab eius caede Sanguinarium accepisse nomen ferunt, inter Oricolum Narniamque, Spoletium et urbem Romam regione media positum’.

Commentary. The *KG* not only misses the location, but even gets the manner of his death incorrect. The *Epit. de caes.* is relying on a Greek source here. Once again Eusebius omits a minor emperor.

70

Valerianus occisus in Syria.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 226), ‘zur Stunde verfiel er der Knechtschaft durch die Barbaren. Nachdem Valerianos als Gefangener nach Persien abgegangen ...’ = *Chron.* 724, 98.23–4, ‘seruitutem statim apud Persas pertulit; et postquam is captus est ...’ = Ps-Dionysius 109.2–3, 6–7, ‘deduxerunt eum in Persiam, ubi seruitutem seruiit ... Et postquam in captiuitatem abductus est Valerianus ...’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 220^g, ‘... Valeriano in Persas ducto ...’.

Aur. Victor 32.5, ‘(Valerianus) bellum per Mesopotamiam ... instruit ... laniatus interiit’.

KG = Eutropius 9.7, ‘captus apud Parthos ignobili seruitute consenuit’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 220^d, ‘a Sapore Persarum capitur ibique seruitute miserabili conenescit’ = *Epit. de caes.* 32.5, ‘in Mesopotamia bellum gerens ... superatus ... captus apud Parthos ignobili seruitute consenuit’

HA Duo Valeriani 4.2, ‘Valeriano apud Persas consenescente’

Commentary. There was fighting against Shapur in Syria, but Valerian drove the Persians back until he was captured in Mesopotamia near Edessa and lived out his life as a captive among the Persians, where he eventually died or was killed (and flayed according to later sources). It is clear that Victor’s account does not derive from the *KG*. This notice is one of the very few in the *Breviarium* that is completely wrong.

Occisus Mediolano.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 226), ‘Gall<ian>os ward getötet zu Mediolanon’ = *Chron.* 724, 98.36, ‘Gallienus occisus est Mediolani’ = Ps-Dionysius 110.3, ‘Gallienus Mediolani occisus est’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 221^h, ‘Gallienus Mediolanii occiditur’.

KG = Aur. Victor 33.18–19, ‘Gallienus ... Mediolanum ... oppugnat, ab suis interiit’ = Eutropius 9.11.1, ‘Mediolani ... occisus est’ = *Epit. de caes.* 33.2, ‘Mediolanum obsedit ... a suis interiit’ = *HA Duo Gallieni* 14.8–9, ‘interemptus est ... circa Mediolanum’.

71

Excessit Sirmi.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* = *Chron. pasch.* 508.8, Κλαύδιος τελευτᾷ ἐν Σιρμίῳ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 222^a, ‘Claudius Sirmii moritur’.

Commentary. Only Eusebius and the *Breviarium* are aware of the location of Claudius’ death.

72

Occisus Aquilegia.

KG (?) = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 222^b, ‘Quintillus ... Aquileiae occiditur’.

Commentary. Of all surviving sources (not just those considered here), only Jerome and the *Breviarium* know that Quintillus died in Aquileia.

73

Hic muro urbem cinxit. Templum Solis et castra in campo Agrippae dedicauit.

KG? = Eutropius 9.15.1, ‘Vrbem Romam muris firmioribus cinxit. Templum Soli aedificauit’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 223^a, ‘Aurelianus templum Soli aedificat et Romam firmioribus muris uallat’.

Agonem Solis instituit.

KG? = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 223^b, ‘Primus agon Solis ab Aureliano institutus’.

Occisus Ceno Fluuio.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 227), ‘durch Hinterlist getötet in Neuwardein’ = *Chron.* 724, 99.3–4, ‘occisus est dolo in domo eius Custodiae Nouae’ = Ps-Dionysius 110.17–18, ‘a custodia noua occisus est’ = Syncellus 470.27, ἐδολοφονήθη ἐν Καίνῳ Φρουρίῳ = *Anon. matr.* 54.-10, ἐσφάγη ἐν Καίνῳ Φρουρίῳ.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 275.1, ‘occisus est Aurelianus imperator Caenofrurio’.

KG = Aur. Victor 35.8, ‘apud Coenofrurium interiit’ = Eutropius 9.15.2, ‘interfectus est in itineris medio, quod inter Constantinopolim et Heracleam est stratae ueteris; locus Caenofrurium appellatur’ (whence Syncellus 470.9–11, ἀναιρεῖται στάσει περπεσὼν μετὰξὺ Βυζαντίου καὶ Ἡρακλείας ἐν τῷ Καίνῳ λεγομένῳ Φρουρίῳ τῶν Θρακῶν) = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 223^c, ‘inter Constantinopolim et Heracliam in Caeno frurio uiae ueteris occiditur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 35.8, ‘interfectus est in itineris medio, quod inter Constantinopolim et Heracleam est’.

HA Aurelian 35.5, ‘apud Caenofrurium, mansionem quae est inter Heracleam et Byzantium ... interemptus est’.

Commentary. All traditions know the location of Aurelian’s death, though it is slightly garbled in the *Breviarium* because its unusual form. The Armenian and Syrian translators translated rather than transliterated the name of the *mansio*. The *KG* can provide exact information about the location of this insignificant *mansio*. Was it known to the author?

74

Occisus Ponto.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 227), ‘Nach dessen Tötung in Pontos’ = Syncellus 471.2, οὗ σφαγέντος ἐν Πόντῳ = *Anon. matr.* 54.11, ἐσφάγη ἐν Πόντῳ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 223^e, ‘Quo apud Pontum occiso’.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 277, ‘occisus est Tacitus Tyana.’

KG = Aur. Victor 36.2, ‘Tacito ... Tyanae mortuo’.

Commentary. Tacitus was assassinated at Tyana on the major highway back from the East, but Tyana is in Cappadocia, not Pontus, and Pontus did not even exist as a province at the time (except as *Bithynia et Pontus*), so Eusebius and the *Breviarium* are in serious error here, though the common error proves a common source. The *Epit. de caes.* mistakenly assigns the location of Florian’s death to Tacitus (‘apud Tarsum febris moritur’, 36.1), but reports a variant version of his death that is also found in the *HA* (*Tacitus* 13.5, *Probus* 10.1, and *Carus* 3.7), and thus probably from a Greek source (perhaps Eunapius, though Zosimus says nothing of it, 1.63).

75

Occisus Tharso.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (Arm., Karst, 227), ‘Nach dessen Tötung zu Tarson’ = Ps-Dionysius 110.20, ‘occisus est Tarsi’ = Syncellus 471.3, οὗ σφαγέντος ἐν Ταρσῷ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 223^e, ‘Hoc quoque apud Tarsum interfecto’.

KG = Aur. Victor 37.1, ‘apud Tarsum ab suis interficitur’ = *HA Tacitus* 14.2, ‘occisus est Tarsi a militibus’.

76

Occisus Sirmi.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* = Ps-Dionysius 110.27, ‘Probus <apud> Sirmii occisus est’ = *Chron.* 724 99.16, ‘Probus occisus est Sirmii’ = Syncellus 471.13/*Anon. matr.* 55.2, Πρόβος ἐσφάγη ἐν Σερμείῳ (Σερμῖῳ *AM*) = *Chron. pasch.* 509.13, ἐσφάγη Πρόβος Αὐγουστος ἐν Σιρμῖῳ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 224^e, ‘Probus ... apud Sirmium ... occiditur’.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 283, ‘occisus est Probus <apud> Sirmium’.

KG = Aur. Victor 37.4, ‘apud Sirmium trucidare’ = Eutropius 9.17.3, ‘interfectus ... est Sirmii’ = *Epit. de caes.* 37.4, ‘Sirmii ... occiditur’.

HA Probus 21.2–3, ‘cum Sirmium uenisset ... milites confugientem eum ... interemerunt’.

77

Excessit Seleucia Babilonis.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (§ 2; Burgess 1999: 60 and 99), τελευτήσαντος Κάρου ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ ...

KG = Aur. Victor 38.3, ‘dum ... Thesiphonta urbem Parthiae inclitam transgreditur ... fulminis tactu conflagrauit’ = Eutropius 9.18.1, ‘cum castra super Tigridem haberet, ui diuini fulminis periit’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 224^e, ‘super Ti-

gridem castra ponens fulmine ictus interiit' = *Epit. de caes.* 38.2, 'apud Ctesiphonta ictu fulminis interiit'.

HA Carus, Carinus et Numerianus 1–2, 'Ctesiphontem usque peruenit ... cum ... longius progressus esset, ut alii dicunt morbo, ut plures fulmine, interemptus est'.

Commentary. The *Breviarium*'s report is independent of the other traditions, though it and the *KG* are referring to the same twin cities by a different name. Mommsen emended 'Babylonis' to 'Babiloniae', which is certainly possible, but I am not sure that this is not a confused reference to the city itself.

78

Fames magna fuit.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 284, 'Magna famis fuit'.

Verbal parallel: *Descriptio consulum s.a.* 370.1, 'Magna famis fuit in partibus Frygiae'.

Occisus campo Margense.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 285, 'occisus est Carinus Margo'.

Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (§2; Burgess 1999: 60 and 99), ἐσφάγη ... Καρίνος ... τῇ κατὰ Κόρνακον μάχῃ.

KG = Aur. Victor 39.11, 'Carinus ... Marcum iuxta ... interiit' = Eutropius 9.20.2, '(Diocletianus) Carinum ... apud Margum ... uicit' = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 225^b, 'Carinus proelio uictus apud Margum occiditur' = *HA Carus, Carinus et Numerianus* 18.2, 'apud Margum ... uictus occubuit'.

Commentary. The *Breviarium* makes no attempt to note the location of Numerian's death. He is the only emperor whose death-place has been omitted, and one suspects that the compiler was lacking a source for it. The three independent Latin sources all roughly agree. The only other source to mention the location of Carinus' death is the *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (Cuntz 1929: no. 564.8–9), written by a pilgrim in 333. It says he died in Viminacium, about ten Roman miles east of Margus, a fact picked up, one would assume, as the author passed by on his way to the Holy Land. We have seen such dichotomies above, and it may be the case that Carinus was defeated and wounded in the battle of Margus and then taken clear of the battle to Viminacium, where he later died. For this, and Eusebius' erroneous location, see Burgess 1999: 85–6.

79

... *thermas Diocletianas* ...

KG? = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 227^g, 'Thermae Romae Diocletianae factae'.

Excessit Diocletianus Salonis.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 316, 'diem functus Diocletianus Salona III n. Dec.'

KG = Eutropius 9.17.3, 'in uilla, quae haud procul a Salonis est, senuit' = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 230^d, 'Diocletianus haut procul a Salonis in uilla sua Spalato moritur'.

Epit. de caes. 39.5, 6, 7, ‘in propriis agris consenuit ... Salonae ... uenenum dicitur hausisse’.

Commentary. Eusebius does not mention the death of Diocletian at all. The Latin sources all agree and are correct. Jerome shows that the *KG* was very well informed about the location.

Maximianus in Gallia.

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 27.7, 30.6, ‘occupauerat Massiliam ... uitam ... finiuit’.

KG = Eutropius 10.3.2, ‘Massiliae ... oppressus ... poenas dedit iustissimo exitu’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 229^d, ‘Herculius Maximianus ... Massiliae fugiens occidiatur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 40.5, ‘apud Massiliam obsessus, deinde captus, poenas dedit mortis genere postremo’.

Commentary. Maximian committed suicide in Marseille. The *Breviarium* is correct, but unusually vague. The singular verb (*excessit*) only applies to Diocletian, so perhaps the compiler did not know how Maximian met his end.

80

Constantius excessit in Gallia.

Origo Constantini imperatoris 4 and 6, ‘Constantius pater Eboraci mortuus est’ and ‘Constantius in Britannia mortuus est’.

KG = Aur. Victor 40.2–3, ‘... in Britanniam ...’ = Eutropius 10.1.3, ‘obiit in Britannia Eboraci’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 228^g, ‘Constantius ... obiit in Britannia Eboraci’.

Commentary. Constantius died in York in Britain, as the other sources state. The *Breviarium* is completely wrong.

Maximianus in Dardania.

KG = Aur. Victor 40.9, ‘Galerius ... consumptus est ... apud Pannonios’.

Epit. de caes. 40.16, ‘Dacia Ripensi ... sepultus est; quem locum Romulianum ... appellarat’.

Commentary. The *Breviarium* is the only source for the location of Galerius’ death, but it is supported by the location of his burial, mentioned by the *Epit. de caes.*, and it is accepted by Barnes (1982: 302). Dardania was in Moesiae at the time, not Pannonia, so Victor is incorrect.

81

Iipse se interfecit uia Latina miliario III.

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 26.9, 11, ‘Rauennam confugit ibique se ... inclusit ... mori coactus est’.

Epit. de caes. 40.3, ‘Romae ad Tres Tabernas exstinguitur’ (= Zosimus 2.10.2, both from the same Greek source, Eunapius).

Origo Constantini imperatoris 10, ‘in uilla publica Appiae uiae tricensimo miliario ... iugulatus est’.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 307, ‘occisus Seuerus Romae’.

KG = Aur. Victor 40.7, ‘Rauennae obiit’ = Eutropius 10.2.4, ‘Rauennae interfecus est’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 229^b, ‘Seuerus Caesar ... Rauennae interficitur’.

Commentary. Severus fled to Ravenna after he was deserted by his troops outside Rome, but was captured, led back to Rome, and held prisoner in the imperial villa at Tres Tabernae on the Appian Way (Barnes 1982: 39 and 65). The *Itinerarium Antonini* puts Tres Tabernae thirty-three miles from Rome on the Via Appia (Cuntz 1929: no. 107.3), so the *Origo* and the *Epit. de caes.* are talking about the same place. It is difficult to know how ‘Via Appia’ could become ‘Via Latina’ or ‘XXX’ ‘III’, and so it would seem that the author is thinking about quite a different villa, perhaps something like the one that contained the mausoleum of P. Valerius Paullinus and the tomb of the Pancratii, which is also at the third mile of the Via Latina (Borg 2013: 146–7). Lactantius and the *KG* suffer the usual compression, mistaking the place of his arrest and deposition as the location of his death (for such narrative compression, see § 42).

82

Occisus ad pontem Muluuium in Tiberim.

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 44.3, 9, ‘Constantinus ... e regione pontis Muluui consedit ... Maxentianus proterretur, ipse in fugam uersus properat ad pontem, qui interruptus erat, ac multitudine fugientium pressus in Tiberim deturbatur’.

Descriptio consulum s.a. 312, ‘uictus et occisus Maxentius Romae ad pontem Muluuium’.

Origo Constantini imperatoris 12, ‘Maxentius campum supra Tiberim ... elegit ... uictus ... periit equo praecipitatus in fluuium’.

KG = Aur. Victor 40.23, ‘Maxentius ... apud pontem Muluuium ... in transgressu Tiberis interceptus est’ = Eutropius 10.4.3, ‘apud pontem Muluuium’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 229^k, ‘Maxentius iuxta pontem Muluuium ... occiditur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 40.7, ‘a ponte Muluio ... demersus est’.

83

Occisus Tarso.

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 49.1, 7, ‘Tarsum postremo confugit. Ibi ... spiritum ... effluit’.

?Eusebius, *Chron. can.* (§ 26; Burgess 1999: 62 and 102, at § 25), ἐν Κιλικίᾳ τελευτᾷ.?

KG = Aur. Victor 41.1, ‘apud Tarsum perit’ = Eutropius 10.4.4, ‘apud Tarsum morte praeuenit’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 229^h, ‘Maximinus ... apud Tarsum moritur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 40.8, ‘apud Tarsum morte simplici periit’.

Commentary. There is uncertainty as to whether the entry quoted from Eusebius actually appeared in the *Chron. can.* Tarsus was in Cilicia, so the report is accurate, though vague.

84

Occisus Thessalonica.

Aur. Victor 41.8–9, ‘Licinius ... Chalcedona concessit ... ibi ... oppressus est’.

Origo Constantini imperatoris 29, ‘(Licinium) in Thessalonica (Constantinus) iussit occidi’.

KG = Eutropius 10.6.1, ‘Thessalonicae ... occisus est’ = Jerome, *Chron. can.* 231^b, ‘Licinius Thessalonicae ... occiditur’ = *Epit. de caes.* 41.7, ‘Constantinus ... Thessalonicam missum ... iugulari iubet’ (= Zosimus 2.28.2, from the same source)

Commentary. Victor compresses his narrative and has Licinius die at the site of his military defeat at Chrysopolis, just outside Chalcedon (for such narrative compression, see § 42). The other sources are correct.

* * *

CONCLUSIONS

I shall now return to my numbered list from the introduction of this appendix and examine the results of the comparisons for each one.

1. For the pre-Roman period it is obvious that we are dealing with information from a text that was popular in Greek in the fourth to sixth centuries, since the parallels derive almost solely from Eusebius’ *Chronographia* and a lost sixth-century text that is witnessed by the *Chron. Scal.* and the *breviarium* of Malalas, both of the sixth century. The common account – from any number of possible origins – may have existed in different works, and these works may have been translated into Greek or may have been read by Greek authors in Latin.
2. The parallels for the account of the Roman kings change character, as we leave the *Chron. Scal.* and Malalas behind, and two close Latin witnesses now appear for the first time, the *Liber de uiris illustribus* of the fourth century and Isidore’s *Etymologiae* of the seventh. We also see more frequent additions made by Jerome from his ‘Latina historia’. The evidence of Eusebius continues from the pre-Roman section, though differences indicate that it clearly originated in a different recension of the common text, and indeed in Eusebius we may simply be looking at nothing more than common traditions rather than any direct literary connection. The text of Servius derives from the ‘Servius auctus’ material, dating probably to the fourth century though via a later recension.

Although most of the surviving evidence for these first two sections exists in Greek sources, the original texts were probably written in Latin and used in Latin by the compiler of the *Breviarium*. This is indicated first by the exact parallels of vocabulary in the Latin texts preserved for the section on the regal period, and by what appears to be an error of *arma* for *aram* in a Greek tradition related to § 3: the recension witnessed by the *Breviarium* and Eusebius had *aram*/βωρόν, while the *Chron. Scal.*/Malalas recension had *arma*/τὰ ὄπλα, a confusion that can only occur in Latin. Likewise, the translation of *portus* as πόρτα (= *porta*) in the Greek version of § 36 indicates a Latin original, since no

Greek would write πόρτα for ‘harbour’, but a mistake of πόρτα for *portus* is easily understood. A Latin original makes more sense of ‘nomine acatus’ as well, since *acatus* is just a Greek word for ‘ship’ (ἄκατος), which no Greek text would have used to define *navis* (or rather the Greek equivalent, πλοῖον). No doubt the word was picked up from the Greek sailors when the ship was in port and its capacity was being recorded. When the Latin text was later translated into Greek, the word was recognized as the equivalent of πλοῖον and the phrase was omitted, as can be seen.

3. In the introduction to this book I suggested paradoxological compendia as a potential source for some of the sensationalist material found in the imperial section of the *Breviarium*. Some of the other content would seem to derive, indirectly, from local Roman *consularia*.⁷ This connection is suggested by the interests and style of the *Fasti Ostienses*, fragmentary epigraphic *consularia* from Ostia covering the period from 48 BC to AD 175. Here we find, with reference to both Rome and Ostia, descriptions of building work (*s.aa.* 46 BC, AD 30, 88, 94, 104?, 109, 109, 112, 112, 113, 126, 127, 147, 152, 152), the erection of statues (140, 146, 152, 164), a flood (147), a tree struck by lightning (91), urban fires (36, 38, 115, 165), the forgiving of rent arrears (48 BC), and emperors’ deaths (44 BC, AD 14, 37, 96), exactly the sorts of material that appear in the *Breviarium*.⁸ One assumes that these are the sorts of things that would also have appeared in contemporary *consularia* written in manuscripts. Also important are the many references in the *Fasti Ostienses* to the distribution of largesse, many noted in the same form that we see in the *Breviarium* (*s.aa.* 44 BC [Caesar’s legacy], AD 20, 37, 84, 93, 103 [reconstruction], 107, 140 [reconstruction], 145, 151, 158, 175 [reconstruction]). These are quoted above under § 35, as are a few parallels from the *HA*. From entries under the years 37, 84, and 93, as well as, for instance, Suetonius, *Domitian* 4.5, we can even see that the *Breviarium* is correct in its statements that the basic amount of largesse in the first century was seventy-five denarii per person per distribution. So although we cannot trust the largesse figures as a whole in all their details (as we saw in Chapter 2), the *Fasti Ostienses* allows us to see that those for the first century at least are grounded in reality and not simply fabrications.

There are also important verbal parallels to be found in the *Descriptio consulum*, *consularia* compiled for the most part during the second half of the fourth century, and the *Excerpta Sangallensia*, a collection of excerpts from the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, which was compiled in the fifth and sixth centuries. These parallels show that for the descriptions of imperial death, famines, military clashes, and widespread death in particular, there were fixed expressions and a fixed style used in this type of text: ‘occisus’, ‘excessit’ (both also found in the *Fasti Ostienses*), ‘magna fames fuit’, ‘magna pugna fuit cum X et Y’, and

7 For a definition of *consularia*, how they were compiled, what their sources were, and descriptions of surviving examples see Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 10–11, 35–57, 60, 133–72, 175–84.

8 For the *Fasti Ostienses* see Vidman 1982 as well as Burgess and Kulikowski 2013: 168–9, 171, 317–18.

‘magna/nimia mortalitas fuit’. In fact, both the *Descriptio consulum* and the *Breviarium* use the same words to describe exactly the same famine in 284 (‘fames magna fuit’, § 78).

The major complication with this hypothesis of *consularia* origins is the fact that all the *consularia* that we know of provide exact dates for the accessions of emperors. As we saw in Chapter 6, the *Breviarium* cannot be relying on such a detailed source for its regnal durations: one or more emperor lists were used for the period before 235, the chronological information on the third century was obtained from a composite source compiled from one or more Greek chronicles, and his duration figures after 282 had multiple, probably even individual, sources. Numerous possibilities can be imagined to explain this problem, such as the indirect use of *consularia* through another compilation-type text or chronicle, but perhaps it may simply come down to the kind of historian the compiler was. If he had a regnal list with the years, months, and days of each emperor (and years and months for the third century) readily available, would he have paid any attention to actual dates in his *consularia*? Would he have been bothered to calculate the figures he needed, or would he have just made them up, as seems to have been the case in at least some instances before 235? Whatever the reason, there can be no doubt that the *Breviarium*’s regnal durations do not derive from the exact day dates that could have been found in *consularia*, yet there are clear connections with *consularia*.

4. The evidence for the death-places is best evaluated first in tabular form.

Table 11: Summary

Brev. – *Breviarium*

SR – *Series regum*

Eus. – Eusebius, *Chron. can.*

WKG1 – Primary witness to *KG*

WKG2 – *KG* witness but non-*KG* source

✓ – historically correct

- – emperor not mentioned
or covered by text

= – same as *Breviarium*

(✓) – more generalized report
(e.g. ‘Rome’ instead of
‘palace’ or ‘Britain’ instead
of ‘York’)

0 – no death-place mentioned

+ – additional detail(s) not found in other sources

=*SR* – same as *Series regum*

x – historically inaccurate

Emperor	<i>Brev.</i>	<i>SR</i>	Eus.	WKG1	WKG2
35. Caesar	✓	-	0	-	
36. Augustus	✓	=	0	x	=
37. Tiberius	✓	=	0	(✓)	

Emperor	<i>Brev.</i>	<i>SR</i>	Eus.	WKG1	WKG2
38. Caligula	✓	=	=	=	
39. Claudius	✓	=	=	0	
40. Nero	✓?	0	(✓)	✓ ⁺	
41. Galba	✓	(✓)	=	= ⁺	
42. Otho	✓	0	0	x	
43. Vitellius	x	=	=	✓ ⁺	
44. Vespasian	(✓ ⁺)	x	0	✓ ⁺	
45. Titus	(✓) ⁺	x	0	✓ ⁺	
46. Domitian	✓	0	=	=	
47. Nerva	✓	=	=	(✓)	
48. Trajan	✓	=	=	x	
49. Hadrian	✓ ⁺	0	=	=	(✓)
50. Antoninus Pius	✓	=	0	= ⁺	
51. Lucius Verus	✓ ⁺	=	0	x	
52. Marcus Aurelius	✓ ⁺	=	=	x	
53. Commodus	✓	=	=	0	
54. Pertinax	✓	=	=	0	
55. Didius Julianus	✓	=	-	=	✓ ⁺
56. Septimius Severus	(✓)	✓	0	= <i>SR</i>	
57. Geta	✓	-	-	0	
58. Caracalla	✓	=	=	x	
59. Macrinus	✓	=	=	0	
60. Elagabalus	✓	=	=	0	✓ ⁺
61. Severus Alexander	✓	=	=	x	x
62. Maximinus Thrax	✓	=	=	=	
63. Gordian I and II	✓	=	-	0	=
64. Balbinus and Pupienus	(✓)	0	-	x	
65. Gordian III	✓	-	(✓)	=	x
66. Philip I and II	✓	-	0	=	

Emperor	<i>Brev.</i>	<i>SR</i>	Eus.	WKG1	WKG2
67. Decius	✓ ⁺	-	=	=	
68. Gallus and Volusian	✓	-	=	x	
69. Aemilian	✓	-	-	0	=
70. Valerian	✓	-	0	0	x
70. Gallienus	✓	-	=	=	
71. Claudius Gothicus	✓	-	=	0	
72. Quintillus	✓	-	-	=	
73. Aurelian	✓	-	=	= ⁺	
74. Tacitus	x	-	=	✓	
75. Florian	✓	-	=	=	
76. Probus	✓	-	=	=	
77. Carus	✓	-	(✓)	✓	
78. Carinus	✓ ⁺	-	x	=	
79. Diocletian	✓	-	0	=	=
79. Maximian	(✓)	-	0	✓	
80. Constantius	x	-	0	✓	
80. Galerius	✓?	-	0	x	
81. Severus	x	-	0	x	✓
82. Maxentius	✓	-	0	=	
83. Maximinus	✓	-	(✓)?	=	
84. Licinius	✓	-	0	=	

COMMENTARY

The *Breviarium*: The *Breviarium* is incorrect only four times, and of those two are paralleled by the *Series regum* and/or Eusebius (§§ 43 and 74), which shows that the fault lay with the compiler's source. The other two instances are late in the work – Constantius, Gaul instead of York (80), and Severus, at the wrong milestone on the wrong road (81)⁹—where the compiler probably had no access to written sources. Two of the locations that I have counted as correct are for Nero and Galerius (40 and 80), where the *Breviarium* is our only source. However, other evidence sug-

9 Though at least it is near Rome, not in Ravenna, as the *KG* states.

gests that the information is accurate, and it is usually accepted by modern historians. The *Breviarium*'s reports are less precise than the other histories in only five instances: Vespasian (44, just names the town, not that it was in the emperor's villa as noted by the *KG*), Titus (45, just names the town, not that it was in his father's villa as noted by the *KG*), Septimius Severus (56, just names Britain, not York, as all the other texts do), Pupienus and Balbinus (64, names just Rome, not the palace, as in the *KG*), and Maximian (79, just names Gaul, instead of Marseille, as in the *KG*). On the other hand, it provides details not found in other sources in six instances: Vespasian (44, name of town), Titus (45, name of town and father's bedroom), Hadrian (49, full name of town), Marcus Aurelius (52, full name of province), Decius (67, in the camp praetorium), and Carinus (78, the territory near Margus, not Margus itself). Only Numerian is missed.

Series regum: Of the twenty-three instances where the *Series regum* gives a location, the *Breviarium* agrees with nineteen. Of the four divergences, two are because the *Series regum* is hopelessly incorrect, probably through copying errors (44 and 45, Vespasian and Titus, of which the first was mistakenly copied from Nerva), one where it is less specific (Galba), and one where it is more specific (Severus). It misses the death-places in four, perhaps five, instances (Nero, 40; Otho, 42; Domitian, 46; Hadrian, 49; and perhaps Balbinus and Pupienus, 64, where the text breaks off). It does not mention Geta (57).

Eusebius: Eusebius does not mention Didius Julianus (55), Geta (57), Gordian I and II (65), Balbinus and Pupienus (64), Aemilian (69), and Quintillus (72) and does not give the death-places for Caesar (35), Augustus (36), Tiberius (37), Otho (42), Vespasian (44), Titus (45), Antoninus Pius (50), Lucius Verus (51), Septimius Severus (56), Philip I and II (66), Valerian (70), and all the most recent emperors between Diocletian and Licinius (79–84), with the possible exception of Maximinus (83). Of the twenty-nine instances where he does give locations, he agrees with the *Breviarium* in twenty-five and disagrees in four (Nero, 40; Carus, 77; Carinus, 78; and Maximinus, 83), of which three are nearly contemporary emperors. Only one location is incorrect (Carinus, 78). He never provides more information than the other sources and is more vague than the *Breviarium* in four instances (Nero, 40; Gordian III, 65; Carus, 77; and Maximinus, 83).

The *KG*: The primary witnesses to the *KG* omit the death-places for eleven emperors, Claudius (39), Commodus (53), Pertinax (54), Geta (57), Macrinus (59), Elagabalus (60), Gordian I and II (63), Aemilian (69), Valerian (70), and Claudius Gothicus (71). Of those whose death-places are mentioned twenty agree with the *Breviarium* and twenty-two do not. In the case of Septimius Severus (56) it agrees with the *Series regum* (York) against the *Breviarium* (Britain). Overall, thirty-one are correct and eleven are incorrect (Augustus, 36; Otho, 42; Trajan, 48; Lucius Verus, 51; Marcus Aurelius, 52; Caracalla, 58; Severus Alexander, 61; Balbinus and Pupienus, 64; Gallus and Volusian, 68; Galerius, 80; and Severus, 81). Of the six major instances of narrative compression in the above list (see § 42), five appear in the *KG* (Otho, 42; Lucius Verus, 51; Balbinus and Pupienus 64; Gallus and Volusian, 68; and Severus, 81) and only one appears in the *Breviarium* (an error shared with the *Series regum* and Eusebius: Vitellius, 43). There are also two instances of

individual texts succumbing to this problem, Jerome (55) and Aurelius Victor (84). The *KG* provides details not found in other texts in seven cases: Nero (40), Galba (41), Vitellius (43), Vespasian (44), Titus (45), Antoninus Pius (50), and Aurelian (73), of which the detail of the latter relates to the location, not the assassination itself.

CONCLUSIONS

The source employed by the compiler of the *Breviarium* was very closely related to the ultimate source used by the compiler of the *Series regum*, whoever and whenever that was. The nineteen out of twenty-three parallels spread through the period under investigation strongly indicate that it was in fact a single source. This text was also more distantly related to the source used by Eusebius. This connection among the three is proven particularly by the agreements among the three texts – the *Breviarium*, *Series regum*, and Eusebius agree in thirteen instances out of fourteen where all three provide a death-place – and by two common errors: the death-places of Vitellius (43, *Breviarium*, *Series regum*, and Eusebius) and of Tacitus (74, *Breviarium* and Eusebius). On the other hand, the sources used by the *KG* were almost completely independent, linked only by historical fact, with the sole exceptions of Gordian III and the two Philips (§§ 65–6), which do appear to be related textually to the *Breviarium*. This would seem to be a case of a common source for the lists used the compiler and the author of the *KG*. Of the fourteen instances where the *Breviarium*, *Series regum*, and Eusebius provide a death-place, the *KG* provides nine: two agree and four are wrong. The *KG* agrees with the *Breviarium* and Eusebius in only ten of the twenty-three instances where all three provide a location, and five are incorrect.

In spite of these obvious and close parallels for the death-places among the *Breviarium*, *Series regum*, and Eusebius, there are differences. The *Breviarium* knows about three Gordians; the *Series regum* only knows of two. The absence of Gordian II lends strength to the hypothesis that the imperial section of the *Series regum* is in origin Latin, and not Greek. There is a similar difference in § 42, where the *Series regum* and Eusebius agree in stating only that Otho committed suicide, while the *Breviarium* is the only text that provides the correct location of that suicide. Similarly, the *Breviarium* notes only that Septimius Severus died in Britain, while both the *Series regum* and Eusebius, and the *KG* in Latin, can put his death in York.¹⁰ So even though these three texts derive their accounts of imperial death-places from a common source, the differences among them that indicate that this source was used in different recensions by these three authors.

The two verbal parallels between the *Breviarium* and *KG* noted just above (Gordian III and the two Philips, §§ 65–6) suggest that, like the other sources noted

10 I cannot help but wonder in this last instance, though, if *Eboraci* has not been lost from the *Breviarium* (or its source), making *Britaniae* a genitive, not a locative, which otherwise is used for a province only once, *Africae*, 63. The locative for a province (Britain or Africa) is, of course, incorrect.

above, which survive in Greek versions but derive from Latin originals, this source for death-places, too, was Latin. There is no other evidence to suggest linguistic origins.

If we can judge from Eusebius' sudden dearth of death-places after Carus, the omission of Numerian in the *Breviarium*, and its errors and vagueness for Maximian, Constantius, Galerius, and Severus, this common source must have concluded with Carus, which is exactly where the accurate accounting of regnal years in the *Breviarium* concludes (see Chapter 6). This suggests that the regnal-year information and the death-place notices in the *Breviarium* were connected and appeared in a single text. We are probably dealing with some kind of expanded emperor list that had used earlier lists, chronicles, and/or *consularia* as sources, combining the features of lists like the *Liber generationis* (detailed regnal durations) and the *Series regum* (mode and place of death). A plausible parallel to the sort of work I am hypothesizing here is the text Mommsen calls the *Laterculus imperatorum ad Iustinum I* (1898: 419–23), which lists every emperor, how long he reigned (mostly just years), how long he lived (only to Caracalla, and again for Constantine, Julian, and Jovian), and how and where he died.¹¹ But as I have said before, we know so little about such texts that we can only guess.

There is much more that could be said about the *Breviarium*, but this analysis has gone as far as it can go here: in spite of the many parallels that survive in Greek texts, the *Breviarium*'s immediate sources were probably Latin, though indirect influences from the Greek historiographical tradition via chronicles seems likely, and there is abundant evidence for indirect connections to the Roman *consularia* tradition.

11 It was compiled mostly from Eutropius and Jerome and so has not been cited before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. EDITIONS OF ANCIENT TEXTS QUOTED OR DISCUSSED

I have not included well known classical texts in this list. See also Chapter 4 for more detail on the individual texts that are employed for Chapter 5, which are listed in chronological order.

- Ammianus Marcellinus: W. Seyfarth (ed.). *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*. Leipzig, 1978.
- Anonymus matritensis: A. Bauer (ed.). *Anonymi Chronographia syntomos e codice matritensi no. 121 (nunc 4701)*. Leipzig, 1909. Ninth century. Cited by page and line.
- Appian, *Basilica*: E. Gabba, A. G. Roos, and P. Viereck (edd.). *Appiani Historia romana* 1. Leipzig, 1939 (repr. 1962), pp. 12–20. Second century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Arnobius, *Aduersus nationes*: C. Marchesi (ed.). *Arnobii Aduersus nationes*.² Corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum 62. Turin, 1953. Fourth century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Aurelius Victor: F. Pichlmayr and R. Gründel (edd.). *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de caesaribus*. Leipzig, 1970, pp. 77–129. Fourth century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Cassius Dio: U. P. Boissevain (ed.). *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum romanarum quae supersunt* 2–3.² Berlin, 1955. Third century. Cited by book, chapter, and section.
- Cedrenus: I. Bekker (ed.). *Georgius Cedrenus* 1. *CSHB*. Bonn, 1838. Twelfth century. Cited by page and line.
- Chronicon ad an. 724 (Chronicle of 724)*: J.-B. Chabot (trans.). *Chronicon miscellaneum ad annum Domini 724 pertinens*. In *Chron. min.* 2. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium 4, Scriptores Syri 4: Scriptores Syri 3.4, versio. Louvain, 1904 (repr. 1955), pp. 63–119. Cited by page and line.
- Chron. epit.* (Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον): A. Pusch (ed.). *Das XPONIKON EPIITOMON der Wiener Handschrift Th. Gr. Nr. XL*. Jena, 1908. Twelfth century. Cited by page and line.
- Chronicon paschale*: L. Dindorf (ed.). *Chronicon paschale* 1. *CSHB*. Bonn, 1832. Seventh century. Cited by page and line.
- Chron. syn.* (Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον): A. Mai and A. von Gutschmid (edd.). Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον. In Schoene 1875: Appendix IV, pp. 63–102. Ninth century. Cited by page and line.
- Chronographia Golenischevensis*: R. W. Burgess and J. H. F. Dijkstra. ‘The “Alexandrian World Chronicle”, its *Consularia* and the Date of the Destruction of the Serapeum (with an Appendix on the List of *Praefecti Augustales*)’, *Millennium* 10 (2013), 39–113. Sixth century.
- Chronographia Scaligeriana* (= *Excerpta latina barbari/Barbarus Scaligeri*): K. Frick (ed.). *Chronica minora* 1. Leipzig, 1892, pp. 184–371. Sixth/eighth century. Cited by page and line. See Burgess 2013.
- Clement, *Stromata*: O. Stählin and L. Früchtel (edd.). *Clemens Alexandrinus* 2. *Stromata Buch I-VI*.³ GCS 52. Berlin, 1960. Second century. Cited from 1.21.144.4, p. 89.
- Consularia Vindobonensia priora* (= *Fasti Vindobonenses priores*): Mommsen 1892: 263–64, 274–334 and Frick 1892: 375–418. *Consularia* compiled between fourth and sixth centuries.
- Descriptio consulum*: R. W. Burgess. *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1993, pp. 215–45. Third to fifth centuries. Cited by year and entry.
- Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*: K. Holl (ed.). *Epiphanius 1, Ancoratus und Panarion*. Epiphanius, Band 1; GCS 25. Leipzig, 1915, pp. 1–149. Fourth century. Cited by line number from § 60.4.

- Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*: E. Moutsoulas (ed.). 'Τὸ "Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν" ἔργον Ἐπιφανίου τοῦ Σαλαμῖνος'. *Θεολογία* 44 (1973): 157–198. See also PG 43: 260. Fourth century. Cited by line number.
- Epitome de caesaribus*: F. Pichlmayr and R. Gründel (edd.). *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de caesaribus*. Leipzig, 1970, pp. 133–76. Fourth century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Eusebius, *Chron. can. (Chronici canones)*: Fourth century.
 Latin translation: see Jerome, below.
 Armenian translation: J. Karst (trans.). *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*. Eusebius Werke 5; GCS 20. Leipzig, 1911, pp. 156–227. Cited by page and line.
- Eusebius, *Chronographia*: J. Karst (trans.). *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*. Eusebius Werke 5; GCS 20. Leipzig, 1911, pp. 1–143. Fourth century.
Series regum of the Armenian manuscripts, see *Series regum* (a later compilation from the *Chronographia*). Both cited by page and line.
- Eusebius, *HE (Historia ecclesiastica)*: E. Schwartz (ed.). *Die Kirchengeschichte*. Eusebius Werke 2; GCS 9.1–2. Leipzig, 1903–8. Fourth century. Cited by book, chapter, and section.
- Eutropius: C. Santini (ed.). *Eutropii Breviarium ab Vrbe condita*. Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1992. Fourth century. Cited by book and chapter.
- Excerpt. Eus. (Excerpta ex Eusebii chronicis)*: J. A. Cramer (ed.). 'Εκ τῶν τοῦ Εὐσεβίου χρονικῶν. In *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae parisiensis* 2. Oxford, 1839, pp. 118–63. Cited by page and line.
- Excerpta Sangallensia*: Mommsen 1892: 298–336 and Frick 1892: 421–23. Excerpts from *Consularia Vindobonensia priora*.
- Fasti Ostienses*: L. Vidman (ed.). *Fasti Ostienses*. Prague, 1982. Composed incrementally between c. 12 BC and c. AD 175. Cited by page number.
- Fer. Dur. (Feriale Duranum)*: C.B. Welles, R.O. Fink, and J.F. Gilliam. *The Parchments and Papyri*. In A. Perkins (ed.). *The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report V, Part 1*. New Haven, 1959, pp. 197–201. Cited by page number.
- George the Monk: K. de Boor and P. Wirth (edd.). *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*. Stuttgart, 1904 (repr. 1978). Ninth century. Cited by page and line.
- HA (Historia Augusta)*: E. Hohl, C. Samburger, and W. Seyfarth (edd.). *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Leipzig, 1971. Fourth century. Cited by book title, chapter, and section.
- Isidore, *Etymologiae*: W.M. Lindsay (ed.). *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum seu Originum libri XX*. Oxford, 1911. Seventh century. Cited by book and section.
- Jerome, *Chron. can. (Chronici canones)*: R. Helm (ed.). *Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Hieronymi Chronicon*.³ Eusebius Werke 7; GCS. Berlin, 1984. Fourth century. Cited by page number and superscript entry letter if appropriate (accession entries have no letters). Also referred to: J. Knight Fotheringham (ed.). *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones, Latine uertit, adauxit, ad sua tempora produxit S. Eusebius Hieronymus*. London, 1923. Cited by page number.
- John of Antioch: S. Mariev (ed.). *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. CFHB 47. Berlin/New York, 2008. Seventh century. Cited by fragment number with page and line number.
- Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*: J.L. Creed (ed.). *Lactantius. De mortibus persecutorum*. Oxford, 1984. Fourth century. Cited by section.
- Liber chronicorum*: K. Frick (ed.). 'Liber chronecorum'. *Chronica minora* 1. Leipzig, 1892, pp. 427–34 = Fredegarium, *Chronica* 1.26, in B. Krusch (ed.). *Fredegarii et aliorum chronica*. MGH: SSRM 2. Hannover, 1888, pp. 37–42. Seventh century. Cited by page and line number of Frick's edition.
- Liber de uiris illustribus*: F. Pichlmayr and R. Gründel (edd.). *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de caesaribus*. Leipzig, 1970, pp. 25–74. Fourth century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Liber generationis*: T. Mommsen (ed.). 'Liber generationis'. In Mommsen 1892: 89–140. Third century. Cited by entry number from p. 138 of this edition.
- Malalas: H. Thurn (ed.). *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. CFHB 35. Berlin/New York, 2000. Sixth century. Cited by book and chapter.

- (Malalas): T. Mommsen (ed.). *Laterculus imperatorum romanorum Malalianus*. Mommsen 1898: 426–37. Cited by page and line. See also Thurn (above), pp. 225–8.
- Nicephorus, Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον: K. de Boor (ed.). *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantino-politani opuscula historica*. Leipzig, 1880 (repr. New York, 1975), pp. 81–135. Ninth century. Cited by page and line.
- Origo Constantini imperatoris*: J. Moreau and V. Velkov (edd.). *Excerpta Valesiana*. Leipzig, 1968, pp. 1–10. Fourth century. Cited by section number.
- Origo gentis Romanae*: F. Pichlmayr and R. Gruendel (edd.). *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de caesaribus*. Leipzig, 1970, pp. 3–22. Fourth century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Polemios Silvius, *Laterculus*: non-calendar text: Mommsen 1892: 518–51; calendar: Degraffi 1963: 264–75.
- Pseudo-Dionysius (Chronicle of Zuqnin): J.-B. Chabot (trans.). *Incerti auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum*. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium 121: Scriptorum Syri 3.1, versio. Louvain, 1949. Cited by page and line.
- Samuel Aniensis: *Summarium temporum*. Patrologia Graeca vol. 19, pp. 607–742. Cited by page number. This edition is reprinted from J. Zohrabus and A. Maius (edd. and trans.). *Samuelis praesbyteri Aniensis Temporum usque ad suam aetatem ratio e libris historicorum summam collecta*. In A. Maius and J. Zohrabus (edd. and trans.). *Eusebii Pamphili Chronicorum canonum libri duo*. Milan, 1818.
- Series regum*: J. Karst (trans.). *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*. Eusebius Werke 5; GCS 20. Leipzig, 1911, pp. 144–55. Cited by page and line.
- Servius, *Commentarius in Vergilii Aeneidos libros*: G. Thilo and H. Hagen (edd.). *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, vol. 2. Leipzig, 1884. Fourth century. Cited by book and line of Vergil as well as page and line of this edition.
- Symeon the Logothete: S. Wahlgren (ed.). *Symeonis magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*. CFHB 44.1. Berlin/New York, 2006. Tenth century. Cited by chapter and line.
- Syn. chron. A* (Συνόψις χρονική): C. N. Sathas (ed.). Ἀνώνυμου Συνόψις χρονική. *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevii* 7. Venice/Paris, 1894 (repr. Hildesheim/New York, 1972), pp. 3–556. Thirteenth century. Cited by page and line.
- Syn. chron. B* (Συνόψις χρονική): F. Cumont (ed.). *Anecdota bruxellensia 1. Chroniques byzantines du manuscrit 11376*. Recueil de travaux publiés par la faculté de philosophie et lettres, 10. Ghent, 1894. Eleventh century. Cited by page and line.
- Syncellus: A. A. Mosshammer (ed.). *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*. Leipzig, 1984. Ninth century. Cited by page and line.
- Theophanes: K. de Boor (ed.). *Theophanis Chronographia* 1. Leipzig, 1883 (repr. Hildesheim, 1963). Ninth century. Cited by page and line.
- Theophilus: R. M. Grant (ed. and trans.). *Theophilus of Antioch. Ad Autolycum*. Oxford, 1970. Second century. Cited from 3.27, p. 142 of this edition.
- Tertullian, *Aduersus Iudaeos*: A. Kroymann (ed.). *Aduersus Iudaeos*. In *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera* 2. *Opera montanistica. Tertulliani opera* 2. *Corpus Christianorum series latina* 2. Turnholt, 1954, pp. 1339–96. I also refer to the edition of H. Tränkle. *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Aduersus Iudaeos*. Wiesbaden, 1964. Third century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Tertullian, *Apologeticum*: E. Dekkers (ed.). *Apologeticum*. In *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera* 1. *Opera catholica. Tertulliani opera* 1. *Corpus Christianorum series latina* 1. Turnholt, 1952, pp. 85–171. Third century. Cited by chapter and section.
- Tzetzes, John, *Scholia in Lycophronem*: E. Scheer (ed.). *Lycophronis Alexandra* 2. Berlin, 1958. Twelfth century. Cited by page and line.
- Zonaras: M. Pinder (ed.). *Ioannis Zonarae Annales* 2. CSHB. Bonn, 1844. Twelfth century. Cited by book and section, with page and line number.
- Zosimus: F. Paschoud (ed. and trans.). *Zosime. Histoire nouvelle* 1². Paris, 2003. Sixth century. Cited by book and chapter.

2. LITERATURE CITED

The titles of all periodicals are abbreviated as in *L'Année Philologique*.

- Alföldy, G. 1996. 'Nox dea fit lux! Caracallas Geburtstag'. In G. Bonamente and M. Mayer (edd.), *Historiae augustae colloquium barcinonense. Atti dei convegni sulla historia augusta*. Munera 7: *Historiae Augustae Colloquia*, nova ser. 4. Bari, 1996, pp. 9–36.
- Baldwin, B. 1977. 'Polyphagus: Glutton or Crocodile?' *AJP* 98: 406–9.
- Banchich, T.M. 2009. *The History of Zonaras. From Alexander Severus to the Death of Theodosius the Great*. London/New York.
- Barnes, T.D. 1967. 'Hadrian and Lucius Verus'. *JRS* 57: 65–79.
- Barnes, T.D. 1970. 'The Lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin Historical Tradition'. *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1968/1969*. *Antiquitas Reihe* 4: Beiträge zur Historia-Augusta-Forschung 7. Bonn, pp. 13–43 (= Barnes 1984, article IV).
- Barnes, T.D. 1971. *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford.
- Barnes, T.D. 1976. 'The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its Sources'. *CPh* 71: 258–68 (= Barnes 1984, article XIII).
- Barnes, T.D. 1978. *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*. Collection Latomus 155. Brussels.
- Barnes, T.D. 1982. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, MA.
- Barnes, T.D. 1984. *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire*. London.
- Barnes, T.D. 2004. 'The *Historia Augusta*, Nicomachus Flavianus, and Peter the Patrician'. *CR* 54: 120–4.
- Belletini, A. 2004. 'Il codice del sec. IX di Cesena, Malatestiano S. XXI. 5: le *Etymologiae* di Isidoro, testi minori e glosse di età ottoniana'. *IMU* 45: 49–114.
- Bennett, J. 1997. *Trajan: Optimus Princeps. A Life and Times*. London.
- Binder, G. 1970. *Der Kalender des Filocalus oder der Chronograph vom Jahre 354*. Meisenheim/Glan.
- Bird, H.W. 1993. *The Breviarium ab urbe condita of Eutropius*. Translated Texts for Historians 14. Liverpool.
- Bird, H.W. 1994. *Liber de caesaribus of Sextus Aurelius Victor*. Translated Texts for Historians 17. Liverpool.
- Birley, A. 1987. *Marcus Aurelius. A Biography*². London.
- Bischoff, B. 1967. 'Eine Sammelhandschrift Walahfrid Strabos (Cod. Sangall. 878)'. In *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* 2. Stuttgart, pp. 34–51 = *Aus der Welt des Buches. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Georg Leyh*. Beiheft zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 75. Leipzig, 1950, pp. 30–48 + addition.
- Blockley, R.C. 1981. *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eutropius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus* 1. ARCA 6. Liverpool.
- Borg, B.E. 2013. *Crisis and Ambition. Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century CE Rome*. Oxford.
- Burgess, R.W. 1993. 'Principes cum tyrannis: Two Studies on the Kaisergeschichte and its Tradition'. *CQ* 43: 491–500 (= Burgess 2011, article VI).
- Burgess, R.W. 1995a. 'Jerome and the Kaisergeschichte'. *Historia* 44: 349–69 (= Burgess 2011, article IV).
- Burgess, R.W. 1995b. 'On the Date of the Kaisergeschichte'. *CPh* 90: 111–128 (= Burgess 2011, article V).
- Burgess, R.W. 1999. *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*. *Historia Einzelschriften* 135. Stuttgart.
- Burgess, R.W. 2000. '"Non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti": The Consuls of 161 and the Origins and Traditions of the Latin Consular *Fasti* of the Roman Empire'. *ZPE* 132: 259–90 (= Burgess 2011, article XV).
- Burgess, R.W. 2005. 'A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the *Epi-*

- tome de Caesaribus* between 358 and 378, along with Further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the *Kaisergeschichte*. *CPh* 100: 166–92 (= Burgess 2011, article VII).
- Burgess, R. W. 2011. *Chronicles, Consuls, and Coins: Historiography and History in the Later Roman Empire*. Variorum Collected Studies 984. Farnham, UK.
- Burgess, R. W. 2012. 'The Chronograph of 354: its Manuscripts, Contents, and History'. *JLA* 5: 345–96.
- Burgess, R. W. 2013. 'The Date, Purpose, and Historical Context of the Original Greek and the Latin Translation of the So-called *Excerpta Latina Barbari*'. *Traditio* 68: 1–56.
- Burgess, R. W. and M. Kulikowski. 2013. *Mosaics of Time. The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD 1, A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from its Origins to the High Middle Ages*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 33. Turnhout.
- Cameron, A. 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford.
- Chamberland, G. 2007. 'A Gladiatorial Show Produced in *sordidam mercedem* (Tacitus *Ann.* 4.62)'. *Phoenix* 61: 136–49.
- Chastagnol, A. 1980. 'Sur la chronologie des années 275–85'. In P. Bastien et al. (edd.). *Mélanges de numismatique, d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à Jean Lafaurie*. Paris, pp. 75–82.
- Cramer, J. A. 1839. *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae parisiensis* 2. Oxford.
- Cubelli, V. 1992. 'La durata del regno di Quintillo: Osservazioni su Eutropio IX 12'. *ZPE* 92: 235–6.
- Cuntz, O. 1929. *Itineraria Romana* 1. Leipzig, 1929 = P. Geyer and O. Cuntz (edd.). *Itineraria et alia geographica*. Corpus Christianorum series Latina 175. Brepols, 1965.
- Degrassi, A. 1947. *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13, *Fasti et elogia* 1, *Fasti consulares et triumphales*. Rome.
- Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13, *Fasti et elogia* 2, *Fasti anni Numani et Iuliani*. Rome.
- von Domaszewski, A. 1918. 'Die Personennamen bei den Scriptores historiae Augustae'. *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse* 13. Heidelberg.
- Duncan-Jones, R. 1994. *Money and Government in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Frick, C. 1892. *Chronica minora* 1. Leipzig.
- Garstad, B. 2011. 'Barbarian Interest in the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*'. *EME* 19: 3–42.
- Geiger, J. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame. A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. Mnemosyne Supplement 295. Leiden/Boston.
- Giannini, A. 1966. *Paradoxographorum Graecorum reliquiae*. Milan.
- Halfmann, H. 1982. 'Zwei syrische Verwandte des severischen Kaiserhauses'. *Chiron* 12: 217–35.
- Hansen, W. 1996. *Phlegon of Tralles' Book of Marvels*. Exeter Studies in History. Exeter.
- Harrak, A. 1999. *The Chronicle of Zuqnān, Parts III and IV, A.D. 488–775*. Medieval Sources in Translation 36. Toronto.
- Heil, M. 2003. 'On the Date of the Title *Britannicus Maximus* of Septimius Severus and his Sons'. *Britannia* 34: 268–71.
- Holzappel, L. 1912. 'Römische Kaiserdaten'. *Klio* 12: 483–93.
- Holzappel, L. 1913. 'Römische Kaiserdaten'. *Klio* 13: 289–304.
- Holzappel, L. 1918. 'Römische Kaiserdaten'. *Klio* 15: 99–121.
- Holzappel, L. 1921. 'Römische Kaiserdaten'. *Klio* 17: 74–93.
- Janiszewski, Paweł. 2006. *The Missing Link. Greek Pagan Historiography in the Second Half of the Third Century and in the Fourth Century AD*. The Journal of Patristic Papyrology, Supplement 6. Warsaw.
- Jeffreys, E. et al. 1986. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. Byzantina Australiensia 4. Melbourne.
- Jeffreys, E., B. Croke, and R. Scott. 1990. *Studies in John Malalas*. Byzantina Australiensia 6. Sydney.
- Krüpe, F. 2011. *Die Damnatio memoriae. Über die Vernichtung von Erinnerung. Eine Fallstudie zu Publius Septimius Geta (189–211 n. Chr.)*. Gutenberg.
- Kyriakidis, S. 2002. 'The Alban Kings in the *Metamorphoses*: An Ovidian Catalogue and its Historiographical Models'. In D. S. Levene and D. Nelis (edd.). *Clio and the Poets. Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Mnemosyne Supplement 224. Leiden, pp. 211–29.
- Levick, B. 1999. *Tiberius the Politician*. London/New York.

- Mariev, S. 2008. *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. CFHB 47. Berlin/New York.
- McCarthy, D. 1998. 'The Status of the Pre-Patrician Irish Annals'. *Peritia* 12: 98–152.
- Meckler, M. 1995. 'Two Papyri and Events in the Life of Caracalla'. *ZPE* 105: 257–9.
- Milne, J. G. 1971. *Catalogue of Alexandrian Coins*. Oxford.
- Mommsen, T. 1850. 'Über den Chronographen vom J. 354'. *Abhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe* 1. Leipzig, pp. 547–693.
- Mommsen, T. 1892. *Chronica minora* 1. MGH: AA 9. Berlin.
- Mommsen, T. 1893. 'Fasti Furii Dionysii Philocali (p. Chr. 354) et Polemii Siluii (p. Chr. 448/9)'. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 1.1². Berlin, pp. 254–79.
- Mommsen, T. 1898. *Chronica minora* 3. MGH: AA 13. Berlin.
- Murison, C. L. 1999. *Rebellion and Reconstruction. Galba to Domitian. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 64–67 (A.D. 68–96)*. APA Monograph series 37. Atlanta.
- Nixon, C. E. V. and B. S. Rodgers. 1994. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford.
- Peachin, M. 1985. 'P.Oxy. VI 912 and the Accession of Maximinus Thrax'. *ZPE* 59: 75–8.
- Pettinger, A. 2012. *The Republic in Danger. Drusus Libo and the Succession of Tiberius*. Oxford.
- Poole, R. S. 1964. *Catalogue of the Coins of Alexandria and the Nomes*. Bologna.
- Praechter, K. 1896. 'Die römische Kaisergeschichte bis auf Diokletian in cod. Paris. 1712 und cod. Vatic. 163'. *ByzZ* 5: 484–537.
- Rathbone, D. W. 1986. 'The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus'. *ZPE* 62: 101–31.
- Reece, B. R. 1969. 'The Date of Nero's Death'. *AJPh* 90: 72–4.
- Reifferscheid, A. 1860. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- Reynolds, L. D. (ed.) 1983. *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.
- Richardson, L., jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore/London.
- Roberto, U. 2005. *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*. TU 154. Berlin/New York.
- Rubensohn, M. 1890. 'Zur der Chronologie des Kaisers Severus Alexander und ihrer literarischen Überlieferung'. *Hermes* 25: 340–50.
- Salzman, M. R. 1990. *On Roman Time. The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford.
- Samuel, A. E. 1972. *Greek and Roman Chronology. Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 1.7. Munich.
- Sartre, M. 1984. 'Le dies imperii de Gordien III: une inscription inédite de Syrie'. *Syria* 61: 49–61.
- Schoene, A. (ed.) 1875. *Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo* 1, *Eusebi Chronicorum liber prior*. Berlin.
- Schwartz, J. 1977. 'Chronologie du III^e s. p. C.'. *ZPE* 24: 167–77.
- Snyder, W. F. 1940a. 'On Chronology in the Imperial Books of Cassius Dio's Roman History'. *Klio* 33: 39–56.
- Snyder, W. F. 1940b. 'Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire. The Epigraphical Evidence for their Observance during the First Three Centuries'. *YCIS* 7: 225–317.
- Stern, H. 1953. *Le calendrier de 354. Étude sur son texte et ses illustrations*. Institut français d'archéologie de Beyrouth. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 55. Paris.
- Stern, S. 2012. *Calendars in Antiquity. Empires, States, and Societies*. Oxford.
- Strzygowski, J. 1888. *Die Calenderbilder des Chronographen vom Jahre 354*. Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts 1. Berlin.
- Trieber, C. 1894. 'Zur Kritik des Eusebios'. *Hermes* 29: 124–42.
- Valentini, R., and G. Zucchetti. 1940. *Codice topografico della città di Roma* 1. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 81: Scrittori, secoli I–VI. Rome.
- Vidman, L. 1982. *Fasti Ostienses*. Prague.
- van der Vliet, J. 1894. 'Aeneas nusquam comparuit'. *Mnemosyne* 22: 277–85.
- Wahlgren, S. 2006. *Symeonis magistri et logothetae chronicon*. CFHB 44.1. Berlin/New York.
- Watson, A. 1999. *Aurelian and the Third Century*. London/New York.

- Witakowski, W. 1996. *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre. Chronicle (known also as the Chronicle of Zuqnin), Part III*. Translated Texts for Historians 22. Liverpool.
- Zorzetti, N., and J. Berlioz. 1995. *Le Premier Mythographe du Vatican*. Paris.

INDEX

This is basically an index of names. I have added a few other topics that I thought would be of interest. References to the edition of the text are in bold. Citations to the edition are in English except for buildings and a few other more technical words and phrases, where Latin is used. All temples are included under ‘Templum’, not the names of the divinities. The translation has not been included except when something in the translation does not appear in the Latin. I have not included the content of the parallel passages in Appendix 4 unless they are discussed.

With a few exceptions, most of the citations in this index are to single references, with no continuous discussion from page to page. Listing each single reference as a separate citation would greatly increase the length of this index and so I have condensed all strings of single citations (e.g. 102, 103, 104, and 105) to a single citation (102–5).

A

Abintinus Silvius (= Aventinus) 22

Abritus **154**, 178

acatus **148**, 166, 186 (see also ship, obelisk-carrying)

Acrota (= Agrippa) 24, 27

Acta fratrum Arvalium (*Acta of the Arval Brethren*) 43, 44, 49

Actium, battle of 40, 87

Adrianople 86

Adventinus (= Aventinus) 21, 27, **144**

Aegyptius (= Epytus) 23

Aegyptus (= Epytus) 22–3, 27, 101

Aemilian 12, 74, 76, 79, 87, 90, 94, 99, 107, 118, 136, 139, **154**, 179, 189, 190

Aemilius Paullus, L. **148**

Aeneas 19, 21–4, 26, **144**, 161, 162

Aeneas Iulius, supposed dictator 12, **148**

Aeneas Silvius 19, 21–6, **144**

Aetmilus (= Amulius) 27

Africa 70–1, 90, 117, **152**, 157, 176, 191

Agon Mineruae **152**

Agon Solis **154**, 180

Agrippa (= Agrippa) 21–2, 26

Agrippa Silvius (see also Acrota, Agrippas, Agrippas, Agropas, and Archippas) 21, 23–4, 26–7, **144**

Agrippas (= Agrippa) 21–4, 26–7, **144**–5, 155

Agropas (= Agrippa) 21, 25, 27

Alba, see Albas/Alba Silvius

Alba Longa 9, 19, 21, **144**, 162

Alban kings 12, 18, 19–27, 94, 101, 142, **144**, 159

Albas/Alba Silvius (see also Anagalbas) 21–2, 26, **144**, 162

Alexander the Great, date of death 68

Alexander, Severus, see Severus Alexander

Alexandria 16, 79, 117, **148**

Allectus 136

Allodius (= Remulus) 21

Altinum **150**, 171

Ammianus Marcellinus 16, 69, 70, 103, 105, 140, 176

amphitheatre, Fidenae 16, **148**

amphitheatre, Rome (Colosseum) 16, **150**, **152**, 169, 174

Amulius Silvius (see also Aetmilus and Amulus) 19, 21–4, 26, **144**

Amulius (= Remulus) 22

Amulus (= Amulius) 22–3

Anagalbas (= Albas) 23

Anchises, father of Aeneas **144**, 161

Anchises Silvius 22–3

Ancus Marcius (Mancius Philippus) 12, **146**, 164

Anonymus matritensis 33, 39–41, 43, 47, 49–52, 54, 57, 60, 69, 74–5, 77–8, 80–5, 159, 167–8, 170–6, 178, 180–1

Antioch 55

Antoninus Magnus, see Caracalla

- Antoninus Pius 57, 67, 89, 93, 95, 97–8,
100–1, 131, 136, 138, **150**, 171, 188, 190–1
Antony (M. Antonius) 40
Anubis-headed baby 13
Aphrodite 161
Appian, *Basilica* 21, 25, 27
Appius (= Epytus) 21, 26, **144**
Apys (= Capys) 21
Apytus (= Epytus) 22
Aquilaia **152**, **154**, 176, 180
aram/arma **144**, 161, 185
Aramulius (= Remulus) 21
Archelais **152**, 175
Archippas (= Agrippa) 22
Arcus nouus **156**
Areaculus (= Remulus) 22
Aremulus (= Remulus) 22–6
Armenia 16
Armenian translations: see Eusebius and Series
regum
Arnobius, *Aduersus nationes* 164
Arpocras, Neronian polyphage **148**
Ascanius/Iulus 21–4, 26, **144**, 162
Atella 166
atria, septem **150**
Atys (= Epytus) 24–6
Augustus 16–17, 39–43, 87, 91, 93, 95, 97–8,
100–1, 122–3, 125, 133, 135, **148**, 166, 187,
190
Augustus, *Res Gestae* 16
Aurelian 79–81, 94, 99, 102, 104, 107, 118,
136, 139, **154**, 180, 189, 191
Aurelius, Marcus 57–9, 88–9, 94–5, 97, 111,
122–3, 133, 136, **152**, 172, 188, 190
Aurelius Victor, *Liber de caesaribus* 9, 12, 16,
29–31, 40, 45, 47–8, 49, 51, 53–4, 56, 60,
63, 65, 69, 74–7, 81–5, 116–17, 135–40,
166, 168, 171–85, 191
Aventinus Silvius (see also Adventinus,
Aventius, and Aventus) 21–6
Aventius (= Aventinus) 21–3
Aventus (= Aventinus) 22
- B**
Babylon **154**, 182
Baiae Veteres **150**, 171
Balbinus and Pupienus 69, 70–3, 79, 90, 94,
99, 107, 116–18, 136, **152**, 159, 176–7, 188,
190
banishment, invention of **146**
barbaricum 178
Barbarus Scaligeri 31
Basilica Constantianiana **150**, 169
Basilica Iulia 13, **148**, **154**, **156**
baths, see *Thermae*
Betriacum 168
binio, double aureus **154**
Bithynia 175, 181
boar, cooked **148**
Boissevain, emendation of Dio 130
boxes, two **152**
bread, four military-sized loaves of **152**
bread, oil, and salt, distributed for free **154**
Breviarium Vindobonense, sources of 12–13,
14, 15–16, 19, 21–2, 27, 87, 90, 91, 92, 100,
101, 102–13, 158–92
Britain 84, **152**, 173–6, 183, 190–1
Brixellum **150**, 168
- C**
Cacus **144**, 161
Caecilius Metellus Pius, Q. **148**
Caenophrurium **154**, 180
Caesar, see Iulius Caesar, C.
Caesarea 16
Caligula, Gaius 13, 42–4, 46, 87, 91–3, 95, 97,
100–1, 122, 125, 128, 132, 135, 137, **148**,
159, 166–7, 188
Calpetus Silvius (see also Capetus, Campeius,
Carmentus, Carpentus, and Carpontius) 19,
21, 24–6
Campeius (= Calpetus) 21, 26, **144**
Campus Margensis, see Margus
Campus Martius 111
Capetus (= Calpetus) 21, 24, 26
Capitolium **146**, **150**, 164, 169–70
Cappadocia 181
Capys Silvius (see also Apys, Cappys, and
Capus) 19, 21–2, 24, 26, **144**
Cappys (= Capys) 23
Capus (= Capys) 23–4
Caracalla 62–4, 89, 91, 93, 95, 98, 108, 111,
127, 136, 138, **152**, 174, 188, 190, 192
Carausius 136
Carinus 82–4, 90–1, 94, 99, 106–9, 114, 136,
154, 181–2, 189–90
Carmentus (= Calpetus) 23
Carpentus (= Calpetus) 22, 24
Carpontius (= Calpetus) 23
Carrhae **152**, 174
Carus 12, 82–3, 90–1, 94, 99, 106–7, 109,
118, 136, **154**, 189–90, 192
Cassiodorus, chronicler 31
Cassius Dio, *Historia Romana* 17–18, 20–1,
28, 33–5, 36, 39–49, 51–65, 67, 87–9, 92,
96, 101, 103, 105, 115, 119–34, 140, 172

- Cassius Longinus, chronicler 103
 Cedrenus, Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν 33, 39, 44,
 47–8, 51–4, 57–63, 65, 67–8, 70–1, 73–8,
 80, 82–4, 89, 165–6
 census, first **146**
 chairs, invention of **146**
 Chalcedon 185
 chicken, live, with feathers **148**
 Christianity, no evidence for in *Breviarium* 14
Chronica urbis Romae 9
Chronici canones, see Eusebius and Jerome
 chronicles, as possible source for *Brevia-*
rium 103–4, 106, 108–9, 110–11, 114, 187,
 192
Chronicon ad an. 724 29, 159, 167, 170,
 173–4, 177, 179–81
Chronicon paschale 32, 39–41, 47–9, 51,
 53–4, 57, 60–1, 69–72, 74–5, 77, 80–2, 84,
 88, 105, 116–17, 138, 159, 163, 166–8, 172,
 174–5, 178, 180–1
 Χρονικὸν ἐπιτομὸν (*Chron. epit.*) 33, 39, 41,
 47–8, 53, 60, 69, 74–5, 77–8, 80–5
Chronograph of 354 9–11, 15, 100, 112
 Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον (*Chron.*
syn.) 22–3, 33, 40–1, 44, 46–8, 50–4, 57,
 60–1, 64, 69, 71–2, 74–5, 77–8, 80–5, 101
Chronographia Golenischevensis 35
Chronographia Scaligeriana 22, 27, 31, 35,
 159–62, 164, 185
 Chrysopolis 185
 Ciden(s)us Silvius, supposed Alban king 22
 Cilicia 55, 184
 Circenses Apollinares **150**
 Circus Maximus **146, 148, 151, 152, 154, 156,**
 166
 Circus Maxentii **156**
 Claudius 44–6, 87, 93, 95, 97, 100–1, 124–5,
 128, 133, 135, 137, 139, **148, 167, 188, 190**
 Claudius Caecus, Appius **148–9**
 Claudius Gothicus 74, 77–9, 94, 99, 107, 118,
 136, **154, 180, 189–90**
 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 28, 39–44,
 46–9, 51–4, 56–9, 87–9, 92, 101
 coinage and Quintillus' reign 78–9
 coins, gold and silver 13, **148, 156** (see also
binio and *denarii*)
 coins, leather 12, **146, 163–4**
 Cologne 54, 88
 Colosseum, see amphitheatre, Rome
 Commodus 58–9, 67, 89, 91, 94–5, 97–8, 108,
 121, 136, 138, **152, 172–3, 188, 190**
congiarium 12, 52, 142, **146, 148, 150, 152,**
154, 156, 163–5 (see also *largesse*)
 – promised, not given 12, 52, **150, 154**
congius 12, **146**
 Constans 137
 Constantine I 10, 13, 14, 84–5, 105, 110, 137,
 139, **157, 184–5, 192**
 Constantine II 137
 Constantinople 16, 180
 Constantius I 84–5, 87, 94–5, 98, 109, 136,
156, 183, 189, 192
 Constantius II 137
 Constantius Gallus 137
 consular lists/*fasti* 10, 34–5, 91, 106, 108, 111
 consularia 32, 35, 85, 103–5, 109, 111, 159,
 186–7, 192
Consularia Vindobonensia 10, 12, 103, 104,
 112, 174, 186
 consuls 10, 12, 13, 32, 34–5, 91, 105, 109
 Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, P. **148**
 Cornelius Scipio Africanus, P. **148**
 Cornelius Scipio Nasica, P. **148**
 Cornelius Sulla Felix, L. **148**
 cots, invention of **146**
 Ctesiphon 177, 181–2
 cudgel, invention of **146**
 Cures Sabini **150, 169**
 Curia Pompeia **148, 165–6**
 Curius Dentatus, M'. **148**
 Cuspinianus, Iohannes, humanist 11
- D**
 Dardania **156, 183**
 death-places 12, 14, 18, 109, 141, 158–9, 178,
 182, 187–91, 192
 Decius 73–5, 87, 94, 99, 107, 118, 136, 139,
154, 178, 189–90
 Decius Mus, P. (= Decimus and P.
 Decius) **148–9**
 Campus Agrippae **154, 180**
 deified, emperors referred to as, Augustus,
 Vespasian, Titus, Verus, Severus **148, 150,**
152
 denarii 12, 16–17, **148, 150, 152, 154, 156,**
 186
Descriptio consulum 35, 85, 103–5, 166, 170,
 172, 176, 180–4, 186–7
 Dexippus, historian 31, 69, 75–6, 103, 105–6,
 178
 Didius Julianus 12, 60–2, 67, 71, 89, 91, 93,
 95, 97, 108, 121, 127, 133–4, 136, 138, **152,**
 173, 176, 188, 190

Diocles of Peparethus, historian 19
 Diocletian 83–5, 90, 94–5, 98, 106–10, 136,
 156, 182–3, 189–90
 – era of, see era
 Diodorus Siculus, historian 19, 21, 31
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, historian 19, 21
 dittography 44–6, 48, 51–2, 74, 77, 85, 87, 90,
 100
diius, see deified
 Domitian 17, 52–3, 59, 67, 88, 93, 95, 97–8,
 100–1, 122–3, 133, 135–6, **150**, 166,
 169–70, 188, 190
 Dominus, historian 70
 Domus Vectiliana **152**, 172–3
 donative 16–17, **146**
Duo, see under emperors' name

E

Eboracum, see York
 Edessa **152**, 174, 179
 eggs, 100 **148**
 Egypt/Egyptian 35, 72, 79, 104, 115–17
 Elagabalus 65–7, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 98,
 100–1, 108, 121, 133–4, 136, 138, **152**, 175,
 188, 190
 elephants 11, 13, **150**, **156**
 Eliogaballium, see Heliogabalium
 emperor lists 28–33, 69, 71, 76, 78, 87–8, 100,
 103, 106, 111–12, 187, 192
 Ephorus, historian 31
 Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 30, 40–1, 43, 52–3, 60,
 69, 74–5, 77–8, 80–4,
 – *De mensuris et ponderibus* 31, 40–1,
 43–4, 46–9, 51–3, 60, 69, 74–5, 77–8,
 80–4, 101, 125, 128
 Epistus (= Epytus) 22
Epitome de caesaribus 16, 29–31, 40, 47–9,
 51, 53–4, 56–7, 60–1, 65, 69, 74–82, 84,
 88–9, 101, 116–17, 129, 135–40, 166,
 168–9, 171–85
 epitomes, compact 32–3
 Epitus (= Epytus) 21–2
 Epytus Silvius (see also Appius, Apytus, Atys,
 Epistus, and Epitus) 21, 23–4, 26–7, 101
 era, Diocletianic 35
 Eremulus (= Remulus) 23
 Eunapius 30–1, 78, 80–1, 103, 106, 116, 181,
 183
 Eusebius 18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 55, 87–8, 92,
 102–3, 106, 158
 – *Chronici canones* 13, 19–20, 22, 29, 30,
 39–41, 43–54, 57–8, 60–1, 64, 69, 71,

74–85, 96, 97–101, 103, 106–9, 116–18,
 129, 135, 139, 159–60, 162–84, 187–92
 – *Chronographia*, 19–23, 29, 39, 158–62,
 185
 – *Historia Ecclesiastica* 29, 44, 50, 52–4,
 60, 64, 69, 74–5, 77, 80–4, 97, 116–18
 Eutropius, *Breviarium* 16, 29–31, 40, 43,
 47–9, 51, 53–7, 59–63, 65, 67–71, 74–8,
 80–2, 84–5, 88–90, 116–17, 133, 135–40,
 160, 166–71, 173–85, 192
Excerpta ex Eusebii chronicis 29, 39
Excerpta latina barbari 31
Excerpta Salmasiana 32
Excerpta Sangallensia 10, 178, 186

F

Fabius (?) **148**
 Fabius, Q. **148**
 Fabius Maximus, Q **148**
 Fabius Pictor 19
 Fabri, Johann, bishop and educator 11
 famines 105, **154**, **156**, 178, 182, 186–7
Fasti Allifani 38
Fasti Amiternini 38, 40–1
Fasti Antiates ministrorum 38, 40–1
Fasti Ostienses 40–1, 52–3, 103–5, 165–6,
 170, 174, 186
Fasti Praenestini 40
Fasti Viae dei Serpenti 41
Fasti Vindobonenses, see *Consularia Vin-*
 dobonensia
 Faunus 9, 12, 20, 23, 26, **144**, 160–1
Feriale Cumanum 40
Feriale Duranum 40, 53–4, 57–8, 60–1, 63–4,
 65, 67, 121
ferialia 42, 91, 110
 Festus, historian 16, 29, 140
 Fidenae 14, 16, **148**
 Filocalus, calendar of 60, 62, 64, 68
 Florian 12, 76, 79–83, 90, 93, 95, 98–9, 107,
 115, 118, 136, 139, **154**, 181, 189
 Forum Boarium **144**, 161
 Forum Caesaris **154**, **156**
 Forum Flaminii **154**, 178
 Forum of Augustus 19, 21
 Forum Romanum 13, **150**, **152**, 155, 167–9,
 172, 175
fossatum **156**
 Francus Silvius, supposed Alban king 22
 Fredegarius, historian 32
 Frygia 182
 Fuchsmagen, Johan, humanist 11
 funeral fund **150**

G

- Galba 12, 45, 47–50, 52, 67, 87, 91, 93, 95,
97–8, 100–1, 122–3, 129, 133–5, 137, **150**,
167–8, 188, 190–1
- Galerius 85, 94, 98, 109–10, 136, **156**, 183,
189–90, 192
- Galic Chronicle* of 511 31
- Gallienus 74–5, 77, 94, 99, 104, 107, 118,
136, 139, **154**, 179, 189
- Gallus 11, 74–6, 94, 99, 105, 107, 118, 136,
154, 178, 189–90
- Gaul 84, **156**, 176, 183, 189–90
- George the Monk, *Chronographia* 33, 41,
47–8, 50, 57–8, 60–3, 69–71, 73–8, 80–4
- Georgius Continuatus 33
- Geta 12, 38, 62–4, 89, 91, 94, 108, 111, 115,
136, **152**, 174, 188, 190
- gladiator shows, first **146**
- glass, broken **148**
- Gordian I and II 12, 69–73, 79, 89–90, 93, 95,
99, 103, 107, 109, 115–17, 136, **152**, 176–7,
188, 190–1
- Gordian II 69, 140, 176, 191
- Gordian III 11, 69–73, 90, 94, 99, 102, 104,
107, 109, 117, 136, **152**, 177, 188, 190–1
- Gordian, *junior* and *senior* 70, 72, 90, 176
- Gordians, three vs two 69–70, 90, 109, 176,
191
- Graecostadium **154**

H

- Hadrian 54–6, 67, 88–9, 93, 95, 97, 121–2,
124, 130–3, 136, 138, **150**, 171, 188, 190
- hall of fame, of Augustus 21
- Harpocras, see Arpocras
- hay **148**
- Heliogabalium **152**, 175
- hemerologia 55
- Heraclea 180
- Hercules **144**, 161
- Herodian, historian 31, 60, 69, 71, 89, 103,
117
- Hippolytus, supposed chronographer 28
- historia*, *Latina*, used by Jerome 25, 185
- Historia Augusta* 16, 29–31, 55–7, 59–65,
67–9, 71–2, 77–8, 80–2, 89–90, 101, 103,
116–17, 135–40, 165, 171, 173–7, 179–82,
186
- hob nails **148**
- Horrea Galbae **150**
- Horrea piperataria **150**, 169–70
- Horrea Vespasiani **150**, 169
- horses, 250 **156**

Hortatius Barbatus, M. 12, **148**

Horti Sallustiani **150**, 170

Hostilian 73

I

- Ilia, mother of Romulus **146**
- instrumenta debitorum fisco* **152**, 172
- Interamna 178
- interregnum, between Aurelian and Tacitus 136, 139–40
- Irene, mother of quadruplets **156**
- Iseum **150**, **156**, 169–70
- Isidore of Seville 31
– *Etymologiae* 163–5, 185
- Italy 9, 16, 19, **144**
- Itinerarium Antonini* 184
- Itinerarium Burdigalense* 182
- Iulius Caesar, C. 12, 38–41, 87, 93, 95, 97,
101, **148**, 159, 165–7, 186, 187, 190
- Iulus, see Ascanius
- Iunior/Iunor, supposed emperor 70–71
- iunior Gordianus*, see Gordian, *iunior* and *senior*
- Iunius Brutus, M. **148**
- Iustilian, supposed emperor 73, 78

J

- January and February, added to calendar **146**,
163
- Janus 20
- Jerome, *Chronici canones* 16, 20–6, 29–31,
45, 57, 71, 76, 78–9, 85, 97, 109, 116–17,
135–7, 139–40, 158–60, 162–85, 191–2
- John of Antioch, *Historia chronica* 32, 43, 46,
48, 51, 60, 69, 71, 74, 76–8, 80–2, 116, 128,
165
- Josephus 55, 87–8, 92, 101, 133
- Jewish Antiquities* 39–44, 124
- Jewish War* 39–49, 124
- Jovian 137, 192
- Julian, see Didius Julianus
- Julian (the Apostate) 137, 192

K

- Kaisergeschichte* 12, 14–16, 18, 29–31, 40,
43, 47–9, 51, 54, 56–7, 60–1, 65, 67–71,
74–81, 85, 87–90, 102–3, 116–18, 135–41,
158–60, 166–85, 187–91

L

- Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 183–4
- Lacus Curtius 168
- lamp stand, invention of **146**

Landolfus Sagax, historian 30
 largesse 12–13, 16–17, 111, 186 (see also *congiarium*)
Laterculus imperatorum ad Iustinum I 192
 Latins **144**, 161
 Latinus 20, 23, 26, **144**, 161
 Latinus Silvius 21–6, **144**
 Laurentian territory **144**, 160
 Lavinium **144**, 162
 Leo Grammaticus, historian 33
 lettuces **152**
Liber chronicorum 32, 41, 43–4, 46–8, 51–3, 57, 59, 62, 68, 74–5, 77–8, 80, 82–4
Liber de uiris illustribus 12, 111–12, 163–6, 185
Liber generationis 9–10, 28, 41–2, 44, 46–9, 51–4, 56–68, 88–9, 100–1, 112, 125, 192
Liber pontificalis 10
 Licinius 12, 84, 86, 91, 94–5, 106, 109–10, 114, 137, **156**, 185, 189–90
 Licinius Lucullus, L. **148–9**
 Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 24, 165
 Lorium, imperial villa **150**, 171
 ludi, quattuor **150**, 169
 Lutatius Catulus, P. **148**
 Luxemburgensis manuscript 10–1

M

Macrinus 17, 64–7, 69, 87, 94–5, 98, 100, 108, 125–6, 136, **152**, 175, 188, 190
magna pugna fuit cum x et y **152**, 176, 186–7
 Magnentius 137
 Mainz 68, **152**, 175–6
 Malalas, *Chronographia* 31–2, 40–1, 43–4, 46–9, 51, 53–4, 56–62, 64–5, 67–71, 73–8, 80–4, 88–90, 116–17, 129, 138, 160–2, 178, 185
 Mancius Philippus, see Ancus Marcius
 Manlius Torquatus, T. (= Titus Marius) **148–9**
 manuscripts of *Breviarium*:
 – Cesena, Istituzione Biblioteca Malatestiana S.XXI.5 11, 15, 111–12, 143
 – St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 878 11, 15, 143
 – Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3416 9–11, 15, 20–1, 27, 110–14, 142–3
 Marcius Rutulus, C. (= Marius Rutulus) **148–9**
 Marcus, supposed emperor 73
 Margus **154**, 190
 – battle of 182

Marius, Gallic emperor 136
 Marius, C. **148**
 Marius Maximus, biographer 29, 31, 56–7, 60–1, 89, 103, 138, 171–2
 Mars, father of Romulus **146**
 Marseille 183, 190
 Maxentius 12–13, 84, 86, 90–1, 93, 95, 105–6, 108–10, 114–15, 137, **156**, 184, 189
 Maximian 83–5, 90, 94, 106, 108–10, 136, **156**, 183, 189–90, 192
 Maximinus 12, 86, 94–5, 109–10, 137, **156**, 184, 189–90
 Maximinus Thrax 38, 67–9, 72–3, 89, 94, 99, 104, 105–7, 109, 117, 136, 138, **152**, 176, 188
 Maximus = Pupienus, 72 (see Balbinus and Pupienus)
 Megalensia 63
 melons, seventy 16, **152**
 Mesopotamia 179
 Meta sudans **150**, 169–70
 Mica aurea 170
 Milan **154**, 179
milites from *mille*, **146**, 162–3
 mine, penal, invention of **146**
 Misenum **148**, 166
 Moesiae 183
 Moesian military/soldier 14, 50, **156**
 Monsieur Mangetout 13
mortalitas, magna **154**, 178, 187
 mule, man-eating 11, 13, **152**

N

napkins, four 16, **148**, **152**
 narrative compression 168–9, 171, 173, 177–8, 184–5, 190
 Nepotian 63, 76, 137, 140
 Nero 11, 13, 17, 44–7, 64, 67, 87, 93, 95, 97, 122–5, 128–9, 132–5, 137, **148**, 167, 188–91
 Nerva 53–5, 88, 91, 93, 95, 97–8, 115, 121, 123, 133, 136, 138, **150**, 169–70, 188, 190
 Nestorianus, historian 70
 Nicephorus, Χρονολογραφικὸν σύντομον 32, 37, 39–41, 43–4, 46–50, 52–4, 57–60, 69, 74–5, 77–8, 80–4, 88
 Nola **148**, 166
Notitia regionum urbis XIV 10, 13–14, 112
 Numa Pompilius 12, **146**, 163–4
 Numerian 82–4, 90–1, 94, 99, 106, 108–9, 114, 136, **154**, 182, 190, 192
 Numitor 21, 24
 nymphaea, tria **156**

O

- obelisk 13, **148**, 166
- odeon **150**, 169, 170
- Olus, head of King **146**, 164
- Origo Constantini imperatoris* 183–5
- Origo gentis Romanae* 9, 20–2, 24–5
- ‘Origo gentis Romanorum’* 9
- Orosius, historian 30–1
- Ostia 14, **146**, 164, 186
- Otho 12, 47–50, 87–8, 91, 93, 95, 97, 100–1, 122, 126, 129, 132–5, 137, **150**, 168–9, 188, 190–1
- Ovid, *Fasti* 19, 21, 24, 40
 - *Metamorphoses* 24, 25, 27

P

- palace (palatium) 71, **148**, **150**, **152**, **156**, 166–70, 172–4, 177, 190
- Palatinus Silvius 24
- palm broom, branches from **148**, **152**
- Palus Caprae 111–12, **146**, 163
- Pancratii, tomb of the 184
- Pannonia 183
- Pannonia Superior **152**, 172
- Pantheon **150**, 169–70
- Papinian, son of 62–3
- paradoxographers 13
- paradoxologiae* 14, 186
- Parilia, date of foundation of Rome **146**
- Parisinus graecus 1712, see Ps-Symeon
- Partectorum columnal/podium ruit* **150**, **156**
- Parthia/Parthians **152**, 177, 179, 181
- Pastis Silvius, supposed Alban king 21
- Paul the Deacon, historian 30
- pearl tunics **156**
- Persia/Persians **156**, 177, 179
- Pertinax 52, 59–61, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97–8, 100–1, 108, 122, 126, 136, 138, **152**, 173, 188, 190
- Phaon’s villa 167
- Pharsalus, battle of 38–9, 87
- Philip I 70, 73–4, 94, 99, 104, 107, 118, 136, **154**, 177, 188, 190, 191
- Philip II 14, 73–4, 94, 136, **154**, 177, 188, 190, 191
- Phlegon of Tralles, chronicler 13, 14
- Picus 12, 20, 26, **144**, 160–1
- pig, suckling **148**
- piglet, looks like an elephant 11, 13, **150**
- pine cones, 100, **148**
- Plutarch, *Lives* 19, 47–9, 129
- poisoners 13, **148**

- Polemius Silvius, *Laterculus* 29, 64, 69, 100, 140, 176
- polyphage 11, 13, 16, **148**, **152**
- Pompeius Magnus **148**–9
- Pons Milvius **156**, 184
- Pons Sanguinarius **154**, 179
- pontes, inter duo* (= Tiber Island) **146**
- Pontus **154**, 181
- Popillius Laenas **148**
- Porta Capena **150**, 169
- porticus, duo **156**
- Porticus Minucia Vetus **150**, 169
- Porticus thermarum Antoninianarum **154**
- portus/πόρτα/porta* 185–6
- Postumus, Gallic emperor 136
- Postumus Silvius/Silvius 21–6, **144**, 162
- pot, Greek, of wine **152**
- Praetorian camp 14, **154**, 175, 177
- Praetorian guard 14, **152**, 176
- praetorium, of military camp **154**, 178, 190
- prison cell, invention of **146**
- Probus 12, 74, 81–2, 94, 99, 102, 104, 107, 118, 136, 139, **154**, 181, 189
- Proca (= Procas) 19, 24
- Procanus (= Procas) 22–3
- Procas Silvius (see also Proca, Procanus, and Procnax) 19, 21–4, 26–7, **144**
- Procnax (= Procas) 22
- Prosper, chronicler 31
- Ps-Dionysius (the chronicle of Zuqnin) 29, 159, 170, 174–5, 177–81
- Ps-Symeon, historian 55–6, 88
- Pupenius, see Balbinus and Pupienus

Q

- quarry, penal, invention of **146**
- Quinctius Cincinnatus, L. **148**
- Quintillus 12, 73, 78–80, 90, 94, 99, 107, 116, 118, 136, **154**, 180, 189–90
- Quirinus **146**

R

- Ravenna 183–4, 189
- Remulus (see also Al lodius, Amulius, Aramulius, Areaculus, Aremulus, and Eremulius) 24–7, **144**
- Remus Silvius 9, 21–2, 27, **144**
- Romans/Roman people 12, 14, **144**, **146**, **152**, **154**, **156**, 162, 176
- Rome, and composition of *Breviarium* 10, 15, 86, 110
 - *Breviarium*’s account of 13–14

- buildings of 10, 13–14, 15, **150**, **156**, 171
- emperors of 9, 54, 68, 70–1, 73, 84, 88, 91, 104, 110, 116, 118, **150**, **152**, **154**, **156**, 166–8, 175, 177, 184, 189–90
- other events in 13, **144**, **146**, 161, 172
- other references to 21, 55, 186
- Romulus 9, 11–12, 21, 24, 111–12, **144**, **146**, 162–3
- Rostra **154**
- Rutuli **144**, 161
- S**
- Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 163
- Salonae **156**, 182–3
- Samuel Aniensis, *Summarium temporum* 22, 29
- sardine pot **152**
- sardines, ten **152**
- Saturn 9, 20, **144**, 160
- Saturnalia 62
- Scaena Pompeii **156**
- Secular Games **154**
- Seleucia **154**, 181
- Selinous 55, **150**, 170
- senate, proclaims emperors 34, 38, 50, 54, 68, 69, 88–9, 91, 100, 104, 121
- senator, from *senior* **146**, 162–3
- senators **146**, **154**, 162–3
- senatum (= curia) **150**, **154**, **156**, 169–70
- senior Gordianus*, see Gordian, *iunior* and *senior*
- Septimius Severus 61–2, 64, 89, 91, 94–5, 97–8, 108, 121, 124, 127, 133, 136, 138, **152**, 173–4, 188, 190–1
- Septizodium **152**, 173
- Serapeum **150**, **156**, 169
- Series regum* 12–13, 22, 159, 166–77, 187–92
- Servius, *Comm. in Verg. Aen.* 164, 185
- Servius Tullius **146**, 164–5
- Severus II 12, 38, 86, 91, 94, 109–10, 115, **156**, 167, 183–4, 189, 190, 192
- Severus Alexander 11, 61, 65–8, 88–9, 91–3, 95, 98, 100–1, 108, 121, 134, 136, 138, **152**, 167, 175–6, 188, 190
- Shapur, king of Persia 179
- ship, obelisk-carrying 13, 16, **148**, 166, 185–6
- Sicilia, supposed town in Britain 175–6
- Silvius, see Postumus Silvius
- Silvius, as *gentilicium* 21, **144**, 162
- Sirmium **154**, 172, 180–1
- Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 105
- sodales Antoniniani* 68
- sorcerers 13, **148**
- Spain **144**, 161
- stadium **150**, 169–70
- statue, golden, of *genium populi Romani* **154**
- Suda* 164–5
- Suetonius, *Vita caesarum* 13, 16–17, 29, 40–1, 43–5, 47–52, 88, 92, 126, 130, 135–7, 140, 167–70, 186
 - *De regibus* 19
- Suetonius auctus 140
- Symeon the Logothete, *Chronicon* 33, 39, 41, 43–9, 51–4, 56, 59–63, 65, 67–8, 70, 72–8, 80, 82–5, 88, 90, 92, 168
- Σύνοψις χρονικῇ (*Syn. chron. A*) 22–3, 33, 39–41, 43–4, 46–54, 56, 58–62, 65, 69–78, 80, 82–4, 88, 90, 117
- Σύνοψις χρονικῇ (*Syn. chron. B*) 33, 39–41, 43–4, 46, 51–4, 57–8, 60, 69, 74–5, 77–8, 80–5, 87
- Syncellus, *Ecloga chronographica* 20–3, 25, 32, 41, 47–50, 57, 60, 69, 74–8, 80–3, 159–65, 167, 170–2, 174–6, 178, 180–1
- Syria **154**, 179
- Syriac epitomes of Eusebius, see *Chronicon ad an. 724* and Ps-Dionysius
- T**
- table, invention of **146**
- Tacitus, *Annals* 16, 41
 - *Histories* 47, 49–50
- Tacitus, emperor 12, 79–82, 94, 99, 107, 118, 136, 139, **154**, 181, 189, 191
- Tarc(y)inius Silvius, supposed Alban king 22
- Tarpeia **146**
- Tarquinius Priscus, L. **146**, 164
- Tarquinius Superbus **146**, 165
- Tarsus **154**, **156**, 181, 184
- Tatius, Titus **146**, 163
- templa, duo **156**
- Templum
 - Castorum **150**, 169
 - Diuorum **150**, 169–70
 - gentis Flaviae **150**, 169–70
 - Iasurae **152**
 - Mineruae **150**, 169
 - Mineruae Chalcidicae **150**, 169–70
 - Romae et Veneris **150**, **156**, 171
 - Solis **154**, 180
 - Vespasiani et Titi, **150**, 169–70
 - see also Heliogabalium, Iseum, Serapeum
- Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 28, 58, 172
 - *Aduersus Iudaeos* 28, 41–9, 88, 92, 101
- Tetricus 136
- Theodorus Scuteriotes, historian 33

- Theodosius Melitenus, historian 33
 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 32, 84
 Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* 28, 39–41, 43–9,
 51–4, 56–8, 87–9, 92, 101
 Thermae
 – Alexandrinae **152**, 175
 – Antoniniane **152**, **154**, 174
 – Commodianae **152**, **154**
 – Decianae 155
 – Diocletianae **156**, 182
 – Maxentii **156**
 – Seuerianae **152**, 173
 – Titianae **150**, 169–70
 – Traianae **150**, 169–70
 Thessalonica **156**, 185
 thistles, with their thorns **152**
 Tiber Island **147**
 Tiber River **156**, 168–9, 184
 Tiberinus Silvius (see also Tiberius, Tittus, and
 Titus) 21–4, 26–7, 101
 Tiberius 16, 39, 41–4, 67, 87–8, 91, 93, 95,
 97, 100–1, 120, 128, 132–3, 135, **148**, 166,
 187, 190
 Tiberius (= Tiberinus Silvius) 21, 21–3, 25
 Timaeus, historian 31
 Timotheus, historian 70
 Tittus Silvius (= Tiberinus Silvius) 22
 Titus (= Tiberinus Silvius) 21–2, 26–27, **144**
 Titus 51–2, 87–8, 91, 93, 95, 97, 101, 121–2,
 124, 126, 130, 133, 136–7, **150**, 169, 188,
 190–1
 torture, invention of **146**
 Trajan 53–6, 64, 88, 91, 93, 95, 97, 124, 133,
 136, 138, **150**, 170, 188, 190
 Tres Tabernae 183–4
 Trojan War **144**
 Troy **144**, 161
 tub, of wine **152**
 Tullius Seruilius. see Servius Tullius
 Tullus Hostilius **146**, 164
 tunics, Persian **156**
 Tyana 181
 Tzetzes, John 20–1
- U**
 uia
 – Appia 183–4
 – Latina **156**, 183–4
 – Nomentana 167
 – Patinaria **148**, 167
 – Salaria 167
 urban cohorts, camp for **155**
- V**
 Valerian 74–5, 77, 94, 99, 104, 107, 136, 139,
154, 179, 189–90
 Valerius Corvinus, M. **148**
 Valerius Paullinus, P. 184
 Valerius Publicola, P. **148**
 Vatican Mythographer, First 24
 Venus, mother of Aeneas **144**, 161
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 24
 Verona **154**, 177
 Verus, Lucius 11, 57–8, 63, 89, 94, 111, 115,
 136, **150**, 171, 188, 190
 Vespasian 45, 50–2, 87–8, 91–3, 95, 97–8,
 121, 123–6, 128, 130, 132–3, 135, 137, **150**,
 169, 188, 190–1
 Vestal Virgins **146**
 Vetrano 137
 vicennialia of Diocletian 84, 110
 Victorinus, Gallic emperor 136
 Vienna 9, 11, 112–13, 172
 villas 167, 169, 171, 182–4, 190
 Viminacium 182
 Vischer school in Nuremberg 11
 Vitellius 12, 48–51, 88, 91, 93, 95, 97, 123,
 125–6, 129–33, 135, 137, **150**, 168–9, 172,
 188, 190–1
 Volusian 11, 74–6, 94, 99, 105, 107, 118, 136,
154, 178, 189–90
 Vulcan **144**, 161
- W**
 Walahfrid Strabo 11
 wall, Aurelian's **154**, 180
 wether (*ueruex*) **146**
 whip, invention of **146**
 wickets, for grain distribution **146**
- X**
 Xiphilinus 33, 103, 128, 130–2, 140
- Y**
 York 173–4, 183, 189–91
- Z**
 Zonaras, *Annales* 21, 33, 40–1, 43–4, 46–9,
 51–4, 56, 58–65, 68, 70–8, 80–2, 84, 90,
 103, 117, 128, 130–2, 140, 178
 Zosimus, *New History* 30–1, 71, 78–9, 82,
 116, 178, 181, 183, 185

The so-called *Chronica urbis Romae* has long been valued for the exact year-month-day figures that it gives for the reign of every Roman emperor from Julius Caesar to Licinius, especially those for the emperors of the third century, whose dates of accession and death are for the most part unknown. This book, for the first time, submits every year-month-day figure found in this text to a detailed historiographical analysis that puts our understanding of the historical accounts of the chronologies of the Roman emperors – particularly those of the third century – on a completely new footing.

In so doing it provides new insights into the nature of this text and the methods of Roman historians. This volume concludes with detailed studies of the chronological information on Roman emperors provided by Cassius Dio and the witnesses to the now-lost fourth-century *Kaisergeschichte*; a new critical edition and translation of the text based upon a fresh examination of all the manuscripts and made in the light of recent studies; and an analysis of the verbal parallels between this text and other surviving Greek and Latin histories, particularly those of the fourth century.

www.steiner-verlag.de

Franz Steiner Verlag

ISBN 978-3-515-10725-9

